DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 446 HE 032 036

AUTHOR	Johnson, Cynthia S., Ed.; Cheatham, Harold E., Ed.
TITLE	Higher Education Trends for the Next Century: A Research Agenda for Student Success.
INSTITUTION	American College Personnel Association, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	70p.; Funding provided by the Fetzer Institute.
AVAILABLE FROM	American College Personnel Association, One Dupont Circle, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20036-1110; Tel: 202-835-2272; Web site: http//www.acpa.nche.edu ($10).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Access to Education; Accountability; *Educational Trends; Futures (of Society); Government Role; *Higher Education; Outcomes of Education; *Research Needs; *Student Development; Technology; *Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

This document is a collection of eight position papers on a research agenda in higher education. The papers are based on a three-year analysis of trends and feedback deriving from conferences and Website presentations. Each paper ends with a list of specific proposed research questions. Following an introduction by Cynthia S. Johnson, the papers are: (1) "Improving Access and Educational Success for Diverse Students: Steady Progress but Enduring Problems" (Patricia King); (2) "Affordability: Responding to the Rising Cost of Higher Education" (M. Lee Upcraft); (3) "Learning and Teaching in the 21st Century: Trends and Implications for Practice" (Marcia Baxter Magolda and Patrick T. Terenzini); (4) "Technology" (M. Lee Upcraft and Patrick T. Terenzini); (5) "The Changing Nature of Work in Higher Education" (Susan R. Komives); (6) "Collaboration and Partnerships" (Charles C. Schroeder); (7) "Accountability for Student Affairs: Trends for the 21st Century" (Gregory S. Blimling); and (8) "Changing Government Roles Relative to Higher Education" (Annette Gibbs). (Individual papers contain references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 430 446

AMERICAN COLLEGE PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

HIGHER EDUCATION TRENDS FOR THE NEXT CENTURY:

A RESEARCH AGENDA FOR STUDENT SUCCESS

Cynthia S. Johnson
Project Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☛ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ACPA
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

HE032036

The
Comprehensive Student Affairs Association

Professional Services for Over 75 Years

FETZER INSTITUTE

The Senior Scholars are grateful to the Fetzer Institute, particularly Dr. Anthony Chambers, Program Officer, ACPA Educational Leadership Foundation and the leadership of Charles Schroeder, and ACPA, and the support of Jean Paratore, President, and Paul Oliaro, Past President, for the funding that made this project possible.

© 1999 American College Personnel Association.
All rights reserved.
This material may not be used for commercial purposes without prior written permission.
This material may be used strictly for educational purposes without permission.

Additonal copies can be purchased for $10.00 each.
For ordering information please contact:
American College Personnel Association
One Dupont Circle, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20036-1110
by phone (202) 835-2272 (ACPA)
Ordering information and/or copies of the papers are also available on the ACPA website at : http//:www.acpa.nche.edu

HIGHER EDUCATION TRENDS FOR THE NEXT CENTURY:

A RESEARCH AGENDA FOR STUDENT SUCCESS

Edited by Cynthia S. Johnson and Harold E. Cheatham

Cynthia S. Johnson
Professor Emeritus
California State University Long Beach

Harold E. Cheatham, Dean
College of Health, Education and
Human Development, Clemson University

Table of Contents

Higher Education Trends for the Next Century: A Research Agenda for Student Success 3
Cynthia S. Johnson

Improving Access and Educational Success for Diverse Students: Steady Progress But Enduring Problems 5
Patricia King

Affordability: Responding to the Rising Cost of Higher Education 13
M. Lee Upcraft

Learning and Teaching in the 21st Century: Trends and Implications for Practice 19
Marcia Baxter Magolda and Patrick T. Terenzini

Technology 29
M. Lee Upcraft and Patrick T. Terenzini

The Changing Nature of Work in Higher Education 35
Susan R. Komives

Collaboration and Partnerships 43
Charles C. Schroeder

Accountability for Student Affairs: Trends for the 21st Century 51
Gregory S. Blimling

Changing Government Roles Relative to Higher Education 57
Annette Gibbs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Higher Education Trends for the Next Century:

A RESEARCH AGENDA FOR STUDENT SUCCESS

Prepared by Senior Scholars
American College Personnel Association (ACPA)

Introduction — Cynthia S. Johnson

The position papers that follow are intended to provoke thought, discussion, and to identify a research agenda for the near future of higher education as we move out of this century. These papers are based on trends documented by a trends analysis. The reader is encouraged to attend the sessions on this topic at the 1999 ACPA convention, to examine their own campus practices in terms of these trends and to help identify and support a research agenda to better serve tomorrow's college students.

Background

The trends project began when ACPA Senior Scholars attempted to identify a research agenda for the future that they could share with Emerging Scholars. As they began discussing trends that might shape the student experience in the future they realized that other organizations had already identified numerous trends and issues. Thus began a three-year Fetzer Institute and (ACPA/ELF) funded project that captured the thinking of many leaders and scholars in higher education, and that will culminate in 1999 with an Emerging Scholar Institute and a research agenda for the future.

In 1997 Susan Komives and doctoral students at the University of Maryland-College Park undertook a trends analysis by reviewing existing literature, and analyzing documents from over forty higher education professional associations. They identified eight major trends and the paper that they produced was used as the basis for discussion at a Summit meeting hosted by ACPA in Washington, D.C. in the same year.

At that all day meeting representatives of the American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NAPSA), the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) and other prominent higher education associations met to discuss the future of higher education with ACPA Senior Scholars. Following that meeting Senior Scholars met, revised the trends paper used for discussion at the meeting, and selected the authors for the topics that are addressed in this collection.

Drafts of the papers were presented in several forums at the 1998 ACPA St. Louis convention, placed on the ACPA website, and each paper was critiqued by at least two other scholars as well as other association leaders. What follows is the final version of those papers produced by selected scholars who volunteered their time and expertise.

The research agenda that was derived from this process will be broadly shared, and will provide the basis for the future work of the Emerging Scholars and Senior Scholars. That work will begin in April, 1999 at the Emerging Scholar Institute, held at the Fetzer Foundation in Michigan.

What Next?

An agenda for future research has been identified, and a parallel discussion regarding trend implications for practice has taken place on the Internet under the leadership of Jean Paratore, ACPA President, and Paul

Oliaro, ACPA Past-President. As you read these essays ask yourself questions such as:

In light of these trends what do higher education professionals and research/scholars need to know and what do they have to do to help students be successful in the future?

Are these the trends that should shape the future of colleges and universities?

If not, how can leadership be provided to shape them differently?

It is our hope that scholars and professionals can anticipate these trends, conduct research to inform practice, and exert a positive influence on the college experience for students in the next century.

Improving Access and Educational Success for Diverse Students:

STEADY PROGRESS BUT ENDURING PROBLEMS

Patricia King, Professor
Chair, Higher Education and Student Affairs
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio

The rapidly changing demographic profile in the United States is beginning to be reflected in the student population of the nation's colleges and universities. Although substantial changes have taken place to improve access to higher education regardless of such factors as age, race, ethnicity, and economic background, efforts to enroll college students in proportions that mirror society at large have fallen short of the mark. Unless we attend to the quality of students' collegiate experiences once they matriculate and provide more effective learning environments for all students, full educational access and educational success will remain an unfulfilled dream for many who seek advanced degrees.

The dream of a college education often stems from the recognition that a college degree affords both economic leveling and social mobility: it contributes to an increase of socioeconomic status more than any other single factor. However, there are still groups lacking the needed access to higher education to improve their positions in life and to take advantage of the economic as well as personal benefits that education has to offer.

Although the first colleges in the United States were founded for an elite group of citizens, a college degree is now accessible to a much broader cross-section of American citizens. As of the 1990 Census, about 20% of adults in the United States had earned bachelor's, graduate or professional degrees. However, educational attainment varies considerably by race and ethnicity. Compared to the 37% of Asian Americans and 22% of White adults who have earned at least a bachelor's degree, only 11% of African American adults and 9% each of Native American and Hispanic adults have earned post-secondary degrees (*Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac*, 1998). This disparity — the rates differ by a factor of almost 4:1 — is contradictory to the democratic ideals upon which this country was founded and strongly suggests that equality of educational opportunity has not been achieved in the U.S. More recent statistics suggest that this disparity between racial/ethnic groups continues. The National Center for Educational Statistics (1998) reported the proportions of beginning college students seeking a baccalaureate degree in 1989 who had completed this degree by 1994. During this five-year period, only about one-half of the White and Asian/Pacific Islander students had graduated (48% and 47%, respectively). The graduation rate for other underrepresented student groups is even lower: only about one-third of Black (34%) and Hispanic (32%) students enrolled in college and seeking baccalaureate degrees had achieved this goal within five years. If students of color continue to graduate at this rate, the new millennium will see a greater proportion of Whites and fewer people of color reaping the benefits of higher education. These data provide a particularly serious warning for educators and policy makers alike since ethnic minorities will soon make up one-third of the nation.

Although many citizens and educators endorse the principles of equal opportunity and access to higher education based on merit, efforts toward diversification are often met with reactions that vary from ignorance and apathy to resistance and even violence. Further, equality of educational opportunity is seriously undermined by incidents of discrimination and harassment that abound against members of the campus community based upon their race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, or gender (D'Augelli, 1992; Herek, 1993; Palmer,

1993, Turner, 1994). Such incidents illustrate how far we are from reaching the goal of creating a nation where all citizens enjoy "certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" (Declaration of Independence, 1776).

Because the word "diversity" is used to mean so many different things (Adelman, 1997), the following definition will be used for this essay:

> "Diversity on campus encompasses complex differences within the campus community and also in the individuals who compose that community. It includes such important and intersecting dimensions of human identity as race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, sexual orientation, class, age and ability. These dimensions do not determine or predict any one person's values, orientation, choices, or responses. But they are by definition closely related to patterns of societal experiences, socialization and affiliation. They influence ways of understanding and interpreting the world" (Smith, 1997, p. 7).

While the goal of achieving diversity in higher education has yet to reach fruition, it is encouraging to note that attention to this goal is no longer an institutional but a national concern: "Almost all campuses now see education of a diverse citizenry as integral to their missions of public leadership and service" (AAC&U, 1995, p. xii).

Educational Benefits of Diverse Campus Environments

Creating campus environments and learning experiences that result in effective learning and high graduation rates for all students is the right thing to do from a social justice perspective and because doing so is consistent with our country's democratic ideals. "When diversity is characterized by patterned inequity and persistent marginalization of specific groups, it is a symptom of democracy's failure, a sign of a society's unwillingness or inability to confront continuing injustices" (AAC&U, 1995, p. xx). Diversity initiatives designed to enhance equity and reduce marginalization have been shown to yield important practical and educational benefits for students (Smith, 1997; NASULGC, 1998; Wilson, 1996). For both philosophical and practical reasons, more than 50 professional associations recently joined the American Council on Education in publicly affirming their support for diversity initiatives in higher education (American Council on Education, 1998). In so doing, these groups also acknowledged their role in explaining the basis for this endorsement to the American public. This statement emphasized four major reasons for their support of diversity initiatives:

- **Diversity enriches the educational experience.** We learn from those whose experiences, beliefs, and perspectives are different from our own, and these lessons can be taught best in a richly diverse intellectual and social environment.
- **It promotes personal growth — and a healthy society.** Diversity challenges stereotyped preconceptions; it encourages critical thinking; and it helps students learn to communicate effectively with people of varied backgrounds.
- **It strengthens communities and the workplace.** Education within a diverse setting prepares students to become good citizens in an increasingly complex, pluralistic society; it fosters mutual respect and teamwork; and it helps build communities whose members are judged by the quality of their character and their contributions.
- **It enhances America's economic competitiveness.** Sustaining the nation's prosperity in the 21st century will require us to make effective use of the talents and abilities of all our citizens, in work settings that bring together individuals from diverse backgrounds and cultures (p. 3).

A major work on the beneficial outcomes of diversity was recently released in a report published by the Association of American Colleges and Universities. Smith (1997) reviewed research on the impact of diversity on students in higher education. Among the findings highlighted in this report are the following:

- Overall, the literature suggests that diversity initiatives positively affect both minority and majority students on campus. Significantly, diversity initiatives have an impact not only on student attitudes and feelings toward intergroup relations on campus, but also on institutional satisfaction, involvement, and academic growth (p. v).
- Opportunities for interaction between and among student groups are desired by virtually all students

and produce clear increases in understanding and decreases in prejudicial attitudes. Such opportunities also positively affect academic success. The conditions under which interactions among individuals are likely to be beneficial include institutional support, equal status, and common goals (p. vi).

- The evidence continues to grow that serious engagement of issues of diversity in the curriculum and in the classroom has a positive impact on attitudes toward racial issues, on opportunities to interact in deeper ways with those who are different, on cognitive development, and on overall satisfaction and involvement with the institution. These benefits are particularly powerful for white students who have had less opportunity for such engagement (p. vi).
- Evidence in the literature suggests that comprehensive institutional change in teaching methods, curriculum, campus climate, and institutional definition provides educational benefits for both minority and majority students. Comprehensive diversity initiatives, beyond their capacity to improve access and retention for underrepresented groups, are related to satisfaction, academic success, and cognitive development for all students (p. vii).

This list of documented benefits afforded to students through involvement with diversity initiatives is impressive — especially in light of the historical difficulties and current urgency to make progress in bridging the many social and cultural divisions that exist in this country. The studies summarized in this report show the educational and social value of addressing diversity issues on college campuses, and how doing so can improve the quality of students' learning experiences and educational successes.

Factors Affecting Access and Educational Success

Improving access and educational attainment for all students requires more than the dissolution of legal barriers that historically denied entry into educational institutions based on race and gender. In today's colleges and universities, barriers to educational access are more subtle, although just as limiting as their forerunners. In order to provide all citizens with the benefits of higher education, we must establish and maintain both formal and informal structures that encourage and support full participation and success. These include using a broad range of admissions criteria, not unduly weighting standardized test scores, and looking at both academic and nonacademic factors (Hurtado & Navia, 1997).

Access to higher education does not end when an applicant receives a letter of admission. When admitted students begin their studies, faculty and staff have an obligation to create campus environments (both inside and outside classrooms) that are conducive to students' successful completion of their educational goals. Creating such environments has become more complicated as the student population has become more diverse, for with different groups of students come different student needs and expectations of college life. For example, academically well-prepared third-generation college students have different needs and expectations than do first-generation college students who did not enroll in college preparation courses while in high school. Part-time adult learners for whom college courses are only one of several life priorities have different educational needs than do full-time traditional-age college students. Students who work full-time while carrying a full course load differ from their counterparts who work a few hours per week, scheduling work around a full schedule of campus activities. Shifts in demographics and student characteristics, combined with retention concerns, should compel educators and administrators across campus to reevaluate whether the curriculum, programs and services they offer effectively help students — *all students* — learn and develop.

Many institutional factors affect whether a college or university creates successful learning environments. Smith (1997) has provided a useful way of organizing the many factors that affect educational achievement for diverse students. She identified four dimensions that describe different aspects of campus diversity: *representation*, "the inclusion and success of previously underrepresented groups" (p. 9); *climate and intergroup relations*, "the impact of the collegiate environment on institutional and student success" (p. 10); *education and scholarship*, "the inclusion of diverse traditions in the curriculum, the impact of issues of diversity on teaching methods, and the influence of societal diversity on scholarly inquiry" (p. 11); and *institutional transformation*, "deep, reorganizing

questions which build upon the many changes prompted in the earlier dimensions" (p. 12). Taking each of these factors into account in creating effective learning environments poses significant challenges for even the most dedicated educators, for within each are potential barriers to access and student success. Further, whether viewed as opportunities or challenges, these factors interact and influence whether students experience a climate that is truly welcoming and that encourages and enables their success.

In addition to the institutional factors noted above, other factors are outside the immediate control of individual colleges and universities and reflect larger social issues and public policies. For example, lack of access to adequate financial resources presents a major obstacle to attending and completing college for many students and is a seemingly insurmountable obstacle for lower income students. The decline in public funding has shifted more of the costs of post-secondary education from the larger society (e.g., through taxes) to the individual student (e.g., through loans).

At the same time that the cost of a college education is escalating, economists predict continuing increases in the number of jobs requiring post-secondary education, with a corresponding decrease in the number and types of jobs available that do not require post-secondary education. Technology is transforming the workplace, requiring greater technical skills for a growing number of jobs. The implication is clear: those who do not possess the necessary skills and expertise to function effectively in a technologically oriented workplace will be less able to compete for these jobs. High school students who have not enjoyed the benefits of access to technology are inadequately prepared to function in "high tech" collegiate learning environments characterized by desk top video units, on-line registration, distance learning, virtual classrooms, and course presentations and project utilizing computers. Many students (such as adult learners and those who come from poor school districts) have had little or no prior experience with technology and find themselves in an environment that is both unknown and intimidating.

One of the greatest external challenges to current practices to enhance access has occurred recently within the legal arena. Throughout the history of higher education in the United States, federal and state intervention has been used to create equal opportunities for all its citizens (Coomes, 1994). Federal policies and legislation such as the Civil Rights Bill, the Americans With Disabilities Act and Affirmative Action were designed to replace past discriminatory practices with those that provided a "level playing field." Affirmative Action, especially as it relates to higher education, is now being dismantled in many states. Contemporary judicial interpretations of the constitutionality of affirmative action mandates suggest that educators designing initiatives to address issues of access and the disparity of educational attainment across diverse groups of U.S. citizens will need to use different strategies than those used recently to achieve these goals.

Implications for the Practice of Student Affairs

As many national reform reports have suggested, if all matriculating students were fully served through policies, practices, and a wide variety of engaging learning experiences, it follows that the quality of student life and learning would be enhanced and that retention, graduation, and satisfaction would be increased. To maintain or create legal and policy stances and campus environments that make it more difficult for students to enter college, have successful learning experiences, and graduate would be contrary to the promise and purpose of higher education and the obligation to educate a diverse citizenry. How can student affairs professionals respond to issues of diversity in the 21st century? The following suggestions are offered as additional ways of serving diverse learners. They are based both on formal reports (e.g., Smith, 1997) and observations by professionals in the field who responded to an earlier draft of this essay.

1. Student affairs professionals need to **become more culturally competent,** to have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to understand and work effectively with diverse groups of students. Applying these skills in many campus contexts and with many members of the campus community (not just with underrepresented or marginalized students) would contribute to a broader campus awareness of the importance of multicultural competencies in our diverse society.

2. The profession needs to **more aggressively recruit diverse students to professional preparation programs and to student affairs staff positions.** This process may include reevaluating assumptions about preparation for entry to the field (e.g., taking into account a broader range of student leadership positions or community service activities). Once recruited, programs and institutions should strive to achieve records of graduation, placement, and professional advancement that match or surpass the historical record of access and professional success.

3. Student affairs staff should **conscientiously prepare themselves for their role as educators.** This includes being knowledgeable about the process of learning, sensitive to differing learning styles, cognizant of how the ways students interpret information and events are grounded in their prior life experiences, and able to discuss and advise students about the implications of these differences in learning strategies and assumptions about the process and purpose of learning.

4. Student affairs professionals should **have a deeper understanding of the historical, legal, political, and administrative issues** surrounding issues of access and student success and **actively promote informed understanding of these issues in order to improve campus practices.**

5. Student affairs professionals **should have a deeper understanding of the types of developmental issues addressed by diverse learners, apply these understandings when working with students, and share their knowledge of student development** with a range of constituent groups (faculty, parents, staff members, students) who might benefit these insights.

6. Student affairs professionals should **actively use their knowledge of student characteristics and learning environments to serve as allies** for underrepresented students or those who feel marginalized.

7. Student affairs professionals should **have a firm understanding of organizational and administrative issues** surrounding issues of retention and educational success for diverse learners, **apply this knowledge** in creative ways as they work to address these issues, and **bring to the attention of campus leaders the benefits of diversity initiatives** to both minority and majority students.

8. Student affairs professionals should share their resources and expertise with faculty to **help create classroom dynamics in ways that are culturally sensitive** and that teach students how to interact in respectful and inclusive ways. Staff members with well-developed interpersonal and group process skills should be especially encouraged to use their talents in this way.

9. In light of the changing student population and their changing needs, interests, motivations and goals, student affairs administrators should **regularly evaluate which services are offered, why they are offered, and who benefits from these services.** This practice could yield valuable information about whether campus resources (from trained advisors to computing technologies) are fairly distributed among students, and in particular, how well they serve underrepresented students.

10. In many ways, students are expressing their interest in and need for more adult involvement in their lives (Willomon, 1997). Intentionally or not, student affairs staff members serve as adult role models as members of a campus learning community, as educated citizens, and as responsible members of our global community. Those concerned with promoting students' educational success should **use this adult role to help students learn, grow, and develop.**

11. In addition to working with others on their campus to enhance students' educational success, student affairs administrators should **seek opportunities to work with those beyond the campus** to achieve this goal, including citizens, civic groups, and state and national policy makers.

By attending to these and related issues, student affairs professionals can seize an important opportunity to contribute to institutional quality, to the quality of students' collegiate experiences, to helping ALL students achieve their educational aspirations, and to helping our country achieve its ideal of equality of educational

opportunity for all her citizens. These are lofty goals, but are goals that are consistent with our professional heritage and goals that we are uniquely prepared to undertake.

Conclusion

The motivation to undertake educational initiatives that address issues of access and educational success may rightly stem from beliefs in democracy and commitments to justice. Conscientiously addressing these issues has practical outcomes as well: attempting to meet the needs of all students by implementing educationally sound programs and practices benefits all students. As Smith (1997) so eloquently summarized:

> "Diversity is finally not about the needs of one or another group competing for scarce resources. It is rather about purposeful and effective designs for supporting all students' educational achievement. As such, it is an integral component of the mission and purpose of the institution, and essential to whether our institutions are or will be positioned to educate all students for full participation in the economic, social, and civic domains of a diverse society" (p. 50)

Students' dreams of earning their college degrees, educators' dreams of helping students to realize their goals, and a country that is still striving for meaningful equality among its citizens all affect and are affected by issues of student access and educational success. Colleges and universities must continue to build on successful prior initiatives, and be steadfast in their commitment to address the enduring problems associated with trying to assure educational equity. Preparing students for responsible citizenship requires nothing less than this type of commitment if today's students are to effectively address the challenges of the 21st century, many of which will involve diversity issues.

References

Adelman, C. (1997). Diversity: Walk the walk, and drop the talk. *Change Magazine, 29* (4), 35-45.

American Council on Education (1998). On the importance of diversity in higher education. *Higher Education and National Affairs, 47* (3), p. 3, February 23, 1998.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (1995). *The drama of diversity and democracy: Higher education and American commitments.* Washington, DC: Author.

Chronicle of Higher Education, Almanac Issue, XLV, No. 1, August 29, 1998.

Coomes, M. D. (1994). A history of federal involvement in the lives of students. In M. D. Coomes & D. D. Gehring (Eds.), *Student services in a changing federal climate* (pp. 5-27). New Directions for Student Services, No. 68. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1992). Lesbian and gay male undergraduates' experiences of harassment and fear on campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7,* 383-395.

Herek, G. M. (1993). Documenting prejudice against lesbians and gay men on campus: The Yale sexual orientation survey. *Journal of Homosexuality, 25* (4) 15-31.

Hurtado, S. & Navia, C. (1997). Reconciling college access and the affirmative action debate. In M. Garcia (Ed.), *Affirmative action's testament of hope: Strategies for a new era in higher education* (pp. 105-130). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (1998). *Returning to our roots: Student access.* Washington: NASULGC.

Palmer, C. J. (1993). *Violent crimes and other forms of victimization in residence halls.* Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications, Inc.

Smith, D. G. and Associates (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Turner, C. S. V. (1994). Guests in someone else's house: Students of color. *Review of Higher Education,* 17, 355-370.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics (1998). *The condition of education 1998.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office. www.nces.ed.gov.

Willomon, W. H. (1997). Has higher education abandoned its students? *About Campus, 2* (4), 4-9.

Wilson, R. (1996). Educating for diversity. *About Campus, 1* (2), 4-9, 30.

I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Renee Borus, Carolyn Brightharp, Malcolm Campbell, Katie Demory, Jodie Devine, Tracy Douthett, Jane Rosser and especially Lorraine Alston in the preparation of an earlier draft of this report, and Harold Cheatham, William Sedlacek, and Reginald Wilson for their helpful critiques of this essay.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ON

Improving Access and Educational Success for Diverse Students

Patricia King, Professor
Chair, Higher Education and Student Affairs
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio

Implications for Research

Trends in access and educational success for diverse learners suggest that while there has been steady and demonstrable progress in addressing these issues, there are also enduring problems. We need research focused on questions such as the following:

1. What educational practices encourage and discourage access and educational success for diverse groups of students? More specifically, what practices work well and work poorly in regard to student subgroups that differ by factors such as age, gender, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, preferred learning style, and learning or physical disability? What experiences are distinctive for these subgroups that affect students' educational success?

2. What other dimensions beyond the familiar categories cited above (age, gender, race, etc.) would better help us understand the complexities of diverse students' learning experiences? What other categories are salient? Further, how can we better understand the effects on learning and development when students claim membership in more than one category (e.g., Hispanic female with a physical disability)?

3. Are strategies designed to improve educational success differentially effective for different student subgroups (e.g., different racial/ethnic subgroups, part-time students, students who feel marginalized)?

4. How do students move from attitudes of intolerance to acceptance to valuing of diversity? How do factors related to cognitive, social, relational, and racial identity development affect this aspect of development? Such questions require longitudinal studies, and both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

5. How can we improve both institutional and national efforts to evaluate the effects of involvement in diversity programs and make these more readily available to others?

6. How can we better assess campus climate in terms of support for underrepresented and marginalized students? What aspects of campus culture are particularly important influences on learning, retention, satisfaction, and educational success of given student subgroups?

7. Despite a high level of interest expressed by students for interactions with people from different backgrounds and highly publicized calls for "conversations about race" from federal, state, and institutional leaders, many students — especially White students — experience little contact with people from different racial or ethnic groups. What factors contribute to the widespread pattern of self-segregation among White students (Smith, 1997)? What types of interactions across racial/ethnic groups enable such conversations and contribute to students' educational success? How can desired educational outcomes of involvement in such conversations be enhanced?

8. What are the multicultural understandings and competencies required for success as a citizen (from the local to the international arena), an employee, a family member? What are the post-graduation experiences of students whose education did NOT include or address these attributes?

9. Does participation in diversity initiatives that are integrated into regular credit courses or required cultural diversity courses yield different experiences and outcomes for students than participation in optional or noncredit diversity experiences?

LOOKING BEYOND THE HORIZON: TRENDS SHAPING STUDENT AFFAIRS

Affordability: Responding to the Rising Cost of Higher Education

M. Lee Upcraft, Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania

Introduction

Affordability has two sides. The first side is that the cost of higher education for students must be within their reach: we must not run up the tuition tab so far that students are excluded because they can't pay for their education, or must select a college solely on the basis of cost. And there is substantial evidence, to be presented later in this paper, that the cost of college may be outstripping students' ability to pay, or at a minimum, affecting their college choice or time to graduation.

The second side is that increasing college costs are a reality (whether justified or not), and many institutions are finally getting the message that they are perilously close to pricing themselves out of an increasingly competitive market. So they look inward to cost savings opportunities, and often, student affairs is high on the list of programs and services to be downsized or eliminated.

The dilemma for student affairs is difficult. On the one hand, we should be supportive of keeping college costs reasonable, because as costs increase, accessibility is negatively affected. On the other hand, institutional cost-cutting may well have a greater negative impact on student services and programs, particularly when competing for resources against the academic side of the institution. Are there ways out of this dilemma that preserves student accessibility to higher education, maintains the quality and quantity of student services and programs, and preserves the integrity of student learning, both inside and outside the classroom?

Student Affordability

No one disagrees that the cost of obtaining a postsecondary education has risen dramatically in the last twenty years. For example, according to the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education (1998), since the early 1980s, college tuition has increased annually at two to three times the rate of inflation. Between 1981 and 1995, tuition at 4-year public colleges and universities increased 234%, while during the same time period, median household income rose 82% and the consumer price index rose only 74%. Further, the typical bill for tuition, fees, room, board, books and incidentals at public institutions is $10,069, a whopping 23% of the average American family's household income (*Time Magazine*, 1998). The problem is not restricted to public institutions. At one Ivy League institution, tuition in 1976 was $3,790. Two decades later that tuition bill was $21,130, nearly a six fold increase (Larson, 1997). To be sure, by 1997 the average increase had dropped to a more manageable 5%, and a few brave institutions actually lowered tuition, but the damage has been done (*Time Magazine*, 1998).

In response to the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education, House Republicans recommended immediate and substantial changes, recommending that colleges redouble their efforts to contain and cut costs, provide American families with better information, address productivity and tenure issues, share facilities and services, and cut inefficient and redundant programs. They also recommended modernizing the student financial aid system, lowering student loan default rates, and tracking college costs annually.

Further, as costs have risen, so have the strategies that students and families use for dealing with them. They include government sponsored incentives (e.g., Education IRAs) to encourage families to start saving early for college, institution based programs (e.g. prepaid tuition plans which lock in tuition rates at current

levels), and federal and state loan programs and other financial aid. According to the College Board, in 1996-97 a total of 55.7 billion dollars was spent on student aid, of which approximately 54% were federal loans, 19% were institutional grants, and 15% were federal or state grants (Cabrera, 1998). Today's student must cobble together a financial aid package which is complex, difficult to access, and more dependent upon loans than ever before.

What is the proper role of Student Affairs in dealing with this issue? There are several options:

1. **Provide students and their families with better information about the real costs of attending a particular institution, in advance of their enrollment.** Too often, students are not realistic about how much money they will need to stay enrolled. We must make sure that students select our institutions based on a good "fit" between the cost of attending and the ability to pay.

2. **Strengthen financial aid advising, making sure that students and their families are constructing financial aid packages that fit their needs.** Most students in higher education today are reliant upon resources outside themselves and their families. Today's student aid regulations are complex and often confusing; institutions must not only help students decide the best financial aid package for them, but teach them money management as well.

3. **Assess the impact of increasing costs of college on college attendance, choice of college, and retention to graduation once enrolled.** While we have anecdotal evidence of this relationship, we need more systematic evidence based on reliable and valid assessments, and we need to adjust our policies and practices accordingly.

4. **Provide cost effective and affordable student services and programs.** If one of the keys to holding down costs is for institutions to become "leaner and meaner," we in student affairs must do our part to make the cost of our services and programs affordable. Later in this paper I will discuss some cost effectiveness strategies.

5. **Become an advocate for affordability.** Too often, we consider admissions and financial aid separate entities which have little to do with "mainstream" student services and programs. Many times these units do not report to the chief student affairs officer. Yet, if we are to be true to our commitment to student advocacy, we must be actively involved in maintaining the affordability of our institution.

Student Affairs and Affordability

Now comes the dilemma. If we are successful in helping our institutions keep their costs within reason, we may be "goring our own ox" because it may not be enough to provide cost effective and affordable services programs. We may, in fact, be targeting ourselves for the reduction or elimination of some of our services and programs, particularly as faculty weigh the relative importance of what they do versus what we do.

Not so long ago, I was sitting in my institution's budget task force, consisting mostly of faculty, arguing the merits of increasing allocations for several of my units. Like most other institutions across the country, my institution has been, for quite some time, alternating between steady state budgets and budget cuts. "Doing more with less" or "doing less with less" has become the operative budget philosophies for the past several years, in part because of the increasing pressure to keep college costs affordable so that enrollments were maintained.

I was making the case for increased counseling resources, based on extensive data on the steady increase in the number and seriousness of troubled students at my institution. I argued for additional resources to deal with alcohol and other drug abuse, a problem well documented from our health education and disciplinary officer files. And finally, I argued for additional resources to expand leadership programs in conjunction with selected academic departments.

I thought I was making reasonable, modest proposals, well grounded in supporting evidence. I was particularly confident about the leadership program, because it related directly to the academic missions of several departments. While I anticipated that members of the task force were unlikely to respond enthusiastically to my requests, I did not anticipate their largely hostile reactions. The first question came from an anthropologist, and went something like this:

> "In an era of increased costs and declining resources, how do you justify spending resources on clearly non-academic programs, particularly when the integrity of academic programs is being threatened by cost cutting measures? The last

> time I looked, we were an academic institution; you know, courses and classes, teaching and learning, studying and mastering content and skills, and getting about the business of preparing students for their chosen fields. If students are troubled or have drug problems, let them stop out and solve their problems on their own; after all, we're an academic institution, not a rehabilitation institute. And if we're to have leadership programs, let's put them in the curriculum where they belong, rather than trusting them to non-academic personnel."

To be sure, not all faculty have this point of view, but subsequently I was convinced that this response was not at all atypical. There are, in fact, very strong affordability winds blowing out there which result in cutthroat competition for resources. For example, a 1994 American Council on Education report indicated that more than two thirds of the public institutions in higher education had undertaken serious steps to reduce expenditures and redirect programs (El-Khawas, 1994). In the "survival of the fittest" mentality of the nineties and the 21st century, can we continue to afford student affairs and keep college affordable for students?

Coping with Today's Affordability Realities

When the affordability pressures first appeared, they were modest and manageable. Institutions typically responded with minimal across the board budget cuts (1 or 2 percent), resulting in annoying but inconsequential reductions in travel, operations, supplies and equipment. This strategy was soon exhausted, as the cuts kept coming and increased in size. Two percent cuts became ten percent cuts, and across the board cuts became more selective; e.g., cutting administrative budgets more than academic budgets. But institutions and their programs and services still managed to survive.

But the pressures continued to mount, and new strategies were developed to cope. Across the board cuts gave way to selected cuts in or elimination of services and programs. When budgets were cut to the bone, and expenditures could no longer be deferred, more fundamental questions were posed:

1. **Do we really need this service or program?** The "essentiality" question is the ultimate affordability litmus test, and must be addressed directly, and with supporting evidence. We must acknowledge that some of our services and programs may be luxuries we can no longer afford. But we must also have good rationales and firm evidence that our essential services are essential, and contribute to the best interests of students and the institution. We must conduct student needs assessments, and show how our services and programs contribute to the fiscal bottom line of the institution. For example, a good student union program may not only meet student needs, but contribute to the recruitment and retention of students, both of which strengthen the institution's revenue flow.

2. **What evidence, if any, is there to demonstrate that this service or program is effective?** The "effectiveness" issue follows closely from the "essentiality" question discussed above.

If the program is essential, is it also effective? Is it doing what it purports to do, and what evidence do we have to support its effectiveness? Perhaps we are most vulnerable to this question because our outcomes assessment efforts are often at best haphazard and at worst, non-existent. To be sure, outcomes assessments (attempting to show a relationship between some intentional intervention and some intended student outcome) are very difficult to conduct, but they are also the most important. They must be done if we are to meet the affordability challenges we face in the future.

3. **Can we provide this service or program in a more cost effective way?** The "efficiency" question certainly must be honestly addressed. There may be some programs and services which could be made more efficient with better resource and personnel management. The key here is holding professional staff accountable for an efficient operation, devoid of "fat" and administered in cost effective ways. Nothing is more vulnerable to the budget axe than a service or program that is poorly managed.

Likewise, there may be overlap and duplication within student affairs functions, and between student affairs and other units within the institution. While "reorganization" is an old bromide which sometimes expands rather than reduces expenditures and is often fraught with political complications, if it is done right, we can achieve greater cost effectiveness.

A third way of achieving greater efficiency is to rely less on full time staff and more on part-time, temporary staff. This strategy will, in fact, reduce expenditures,

because part-time and temporary staff will receive fewer or no fringe benefits, and their compensation typically will be lower than that of full time staff. The downsides are considerable. There is less continuity of service to students, and quality of service may be compromised as less qualified personnel are used. There is also the ethical issue of using part-time and temporary staff to do the work of full-time professional staff without equitable compensation.

A fourth way of achieving greater efficiency is to reduce full time staff contracts to only those times when students are enrolled. A typical strategy is to reduce staff contracts from twelve months to eleven, ten, or nine. This strategy can save a considerable amount of money, while providing an answer to the question posed by faculty, "We don't get paid over the summer; why should the student affairs staff?" The downside, of course, is that reducing contracts to coincide with student presence eliminates essential preparation and planning time necessary to the functioning of most student services.

4. **Can we provide this service or program on a more limited basis?** This "downsizing" question often becomes the most typical response to affordability/accountability issue. Probably the best example is what's happened to psychological counseling services over the past twenty years. Comprehensive counseling centers with no service limitations have given way to more limited operations focusing on crisis intervention, short term-therapies, and case management. The same holds true for many other student services.

Another downsizing strategy is to limit the times services are offered, either by hours of the day, or between semesters or over the summer. Unfortunately, students may need services and programs during evening hours, or at times when they are not enrolled. The challenge, of course, is not to "downsize" to the point of totally compromising the integrity of what is being offered, or seriously jeopardize students.

5. **Can other revenue sources be developed to support this service or program?** There are several options to consider with this question, which augment or replace "hard money" institutional allocations. The first is mandatory fees for services, paid for by all students who enroll, such as student activities fees, health fees, or counseling fees. While this strategy ensures a reliable revenue flow, it does force some students to pay for services they never will use.

Another is selected fees for selected services, based on student use, such as fees for physician visits in the health service, per session fees in counseling services, or computer connectivity fees in residence halls. While the rationale is that only students who use services should be required to pay for them, this strategy does raise the issue of access to services for students who need them but cannot afford them.

A third revenue source is grants from federal, state, or private sources. There is considerable advantage in making use of outside sources, and they may provide excellent temporary relief for budgetary shortfalls. The downsides are that not all student affairs functions can qualify for outside grants, and when the grants disappear, the budget problem almost always resurfaces. A related source of revenue is funds raised from development efforts, with somewhat the same advantages and downsides as those that accompnay grants.

A fourth revenue source is so-called "profit centers" which generate revenue from the entire collegiate community, not just students. There are many examples, depending upon the institution.

Student affairs may operate campus wide, revenue generating services such as audio visual services, copy/printing services, food services, pharmacies, testing services, parking and traffic fines, and others. Entering into profit making ventures is risky (they may generate deficits, not profits), and initiating or capturing such services may be politically difficult, because everyone else is looking to generate revenue as well. But they do provide yet another option to deal with the affordability issue.

6. **Can this service or program be provided outside the institution?** The "outsourcing" question is worth considering, and is certainly not a new idea. Outsourcing campus food services in residence halls and student unions has been an accepted practice for years, but more recently, counseling services, health services, placement services, and even residence halls have become candidates for outsourcing. However, outsourcing must be approached with great caution. While it may seem expedient and cost effective to ask a community or outside agency to provide a particular service or program, either on or off campus, sometimes the

intended benefits do not materialize. Quality, service, customer satisfaction, cost, and other factors must be projected before outsourcing, and monitored very carefully afterwards.

If we are to survive the affordability crisis, we in student affairs must be able to address these questions, in order to preserve student accessibility in the first place, and in the second place, maintain the integrity and quality of our services and programs. Without this kind of effort, the student experience will suffer, and so will students' academic and personal success. But how do we get the job done?

Keys to Successful Affordability Efforts

I believe there are at least four strategies to address the affordability challenge of the rest of the nineties and into the next century. First, I believe whatever we do must be connected to student learning and the academic mission of the institution. While I also believe that student development is a desirable goal and often is indirectly connected to students' academic success, from a resource management and affordability standpoint, I will hitch my star to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 1987 *Perspective on Student Affairs*, in which the first assumption identified is that the academic mission of an institution is preeminent:

> "Colleges and universities must organize their primary activities around the academic experience: the curriculum, the library, the classroom, and the laboratory. The work of student affairs should not compete with and cannot substitute for the academic enterprise. As a partner in the educational enterprise, student affairs enhances and supports the academic mission (pp. 9-10)."

In other words, everything we do must somehow contribute to student success, academically defined as their academic achievement and persistence to graduation. Fortunately, there is considerable evidence that just about everything we do is, in fact, directly or indirectly related to student learning, academic achievement, and retention (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, Kuh, et al, 1994, and many others). For the purposes of competing for fiscal resources, this "take" on our work is absolutely essential.

Second, we must have data to substantiate our services and programs. These pressures are both national and local. For example, the *Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac* (1997) reported that twenty-one states had developed budgeting policies that tied at least some of the appropriations made to individual public institutions to the institution's success in meeting certain measurable goals. And many of the typical local pressures have been identified throughout this paper.

I believe that our resources can only be maintained and enhanced if we have a comprehensive assessment program. According to Upcraft and Schuh (1996), we must systematically collect data on student use of services and programs, conduct student needs and student satisfaction studies, assess campus cultures and climates, conform to nationally accepted standards of performance, and most importantly conduct studies that show a relationship between what we do and some intended and desirable outcome. Of course, assessment does not guarantee adequate resources, but it may go a long way toward that goal.

Third, we must demonstrate our importance to the entire collegiate community. It is not enough to show our connection to the academic enterprise, or even prove that we serve the best interests of students. We also offer basic services often independent of our educational functions, without which the institution could not function. These include financial aid, food services, safety and security, registrar, admissions, and housing, among others.

But perhaps most important, we must be politically skillful, in every positive sense of that word. Budgeting is first and foremost a "people" process, relying heavily on those persons who hold the pursestrings. These people most likely will include the president, the chief budget officer, the chief academic officer, and the faculty, or a budget committee representing all these people. So the first step is to know who are these people who will ultimately decide our fate. We must make sure they are continually bombarded with notices of our accomplishments and evidence of our effectiveness. They must understand our importance to the institution, and our role in students' academic success. Ideally, this means student affairs must have access to decision making at the highest levels of institution, and participate in the decision making process.

Second, there is no substitute for formal and informal contacts with the faculty. Nothing mobilizes faculty to protect their vested interests than a budget crisis. In

those critical times, faculty should know and understand the vital role played by student affairs in the work of the faculty and the academic success of students. Faculty advocates for student affairs are most often born out of participation in services and programs which connect students' in class and out of class experiences. These faculty can not only inform their colleagues of the critical role of student affairs in helping students succeed academically, but provide support for maintaining or enhancing resources for student services and programs.

Third, building political support for budget allocations is a year-round effort. Too often, we politick around the time of our annual budget skirmish, rather than seeing the securing of adequate resources as continuous process. This means not only working behind the scenes and informally with key people, but also engaging, in a highly visible and public way, in the process of keeping the collegiate community informed about our role and effectiveness. We must "toot our own horn" continuously and effectively, publically and behind the scenes, formally and informally, with those within the institution who determine our resources.

The Challenge Ahead

I believe the affordability issue is here to stay. Costs will continue to rise (albeit at a less dramatic and more reasonable rate). Further, I see no end in sight for the pressures to justify what we do, why we do it, how we do it, and most important, how we pay for it in ways that keep a college education affordable for students. We must meet the two affordability challenges: how to keep college costs reasonable while at the same time maintaining the integrity of our academic and student affairs programs and services.

References

Cabrera, A. F., "Estimated Student Aid by Source, 1996-97." University Park, PA. Unpublished paper.

Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac. (1997, August 29), Volume XLIV, No. 1, p. 12.

Citizens for Responsible Education Reform (1998). Washington, DC: *National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education*.

El-Khawas, E. (1994). *Restructuring initiatives in public higher education: Institutional responses to financial constraints*. Research Briefs, vol. 5, no. 8. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Kuh, G. D., Branch Douglas, K., Lund, J. P. & Ramin-Gyurnek, J., (1994). *Student learning outside the classroom: Transcending artificial boundaries*, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Larson, Erik, "Why Colleges Cost Too Much." (March 17, 1997). *Time*, Vol. 149, No. 11.

Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Time, "Can you pay his way through college?" (August 17, 1998). Vol. 152, No. 7.

Upcraft, M. L. & Schuh, J. H., (1996). *Assessment in student affairs: A guide for practitioners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ON

Affordability: Responding to the Rising Cost of Higher Education

M. Lee Upcraft, Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania

1. What impact do the rising costs of higher education have upon enrollments?
2. Do the rising costs of higher education impact college choice?
3. Do the rising costs of higher education impact students differentially, on the basis of race/ethnicity, gender, age, disability, or other student characteristics?
4. On what basis is the need for a student service or program determined?
5. By what criteria is the effectiveness of a student service or program determined?
6. On what basis is the cost effectiveness of a student service or program determined?
7. On what basis are alternative ways of funding and providing for student services and programs (e.g. fees for services or outsourcing) determined?
8. What impact does the "downsizing" of a service or program have on student learning and retention?
9. What are effective means of justifying our services and programs to intended audiences, such as administrators, faculty, governing boards, students, and other stakeholders?

Learning and Teaching in the 21ST Century:

TRENDS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

Marcia Baxter Magolda, Professor
Educational Leadership
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

Patrick T. Terenzini, Professor
Center for Study of Higher Education
Pennsylvania State University,
University Park, Pennsylvania

In Consultation with
Pat Hutchings, Director
American Association for Higher Education Teaching Institute

As contemporary society becomes increasingly diverse and complex, so does the process of preparing young people for life as independent thinkers, productive citizens, and future leaders. The changing nature of students, the collegiate experience, learning, teaching, and outcomes assessment all have substantive implications for altering educational practice. Trends in these five arenas are examined here as a foundation for exploring their implications for research and guiding educational practice in the next century.

The Changing Nature of Students

The salient characteristics of today's students include their diversity in age, socioeconomic status, gender, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, and learning and physical ability. Their diversity may be greater today than at any times in the history of American higher education. Indeed, the "traditional" college student—white, male, 18- to 20-years old, attending a four-year, liberal arts college full-time, and living on campus—is now in the minority in higher education. In addition to those students, today's college population also includes significant proportions of older students returning to school due to changes in the economy, women's roles, and work environments. Over half of the undergraduate population is over 21; 41% are over 24 (National Center for Education Statistics, 1994).

Students vary in many other ways. The socioeconomic status of today's students ranges from those whose families are able to finance their education fully, to adults whose incomes must also cover family expenses, to low-income students who require financial assistance. Growing violence in secondary schools and neighborhoods has affected some students' pre-college educational experiences in ways totally foreign to "traditional" students and most faculty members who were themselves "traditional" college students (Terenzini, et al., 1994; Terenzini, Springer, Yaeger, Pascarella, & Nora, 1996). Economic and societal conditions during their youth have led many of today's college students to value vocational training over learning for learning's sake (Levine & Cureton, 1998), resulting in a wide array of attitudes and motivations toward learning. Women currently make up the majority of most institutions' undergraduate student bodies; women's changing educational and political interests have expanded in some traditionally male-dominated fields and decreased other, traditionally female-dominated fields; their increased presence and different needs have altered campus services and raised the issue of bias toward particular groups of students (El-Khawas, 1996). Members of historically under-represented racial and ethnic groups — African American, Hispanic, Asian American, Native American, and foreign nationals — now constitute approximately a fourth of today's undergraduates (Carter & Wilson, 1995).

Such heterogeneity in the student body requires the expansion of perspectives taught in higher education. It also requires educational communities open to difference, as well as new and varied pedagogies and assumptions about levels of preparation, learning styles, and available time for study (as opposed to fam-

ily and occupational responsibilities). Awareness of, and openness to, differences are also crucial to the growing population of gay, lesbian, and bisexual students whose marginalization affects their educational experience. Similarly, students with disabilities—whether physical, learning, or health-related—are attending college in increasing numbers and require accommodations to maximize their educational opportunities. Students are increasingly coming from single-parent homes, have experienced mental or physical abuse, have experienced substance abuse, and seek counseling for personal and family mental health issues during the college years (Upcraft, 1994). Levine and Cureton report that "students are coming to college overwhelmed and more damaged than those of previous years" (1998, p. 95). Their statement is based on increases in use of psychological counseling services, eating disorders, classroom disruption, alcohol abuse, gambling, and suicide attempts. The complexity of this student body produces multiple educational goals, learning approaches, and situational factors that can present instructors and administrators alike with a formidable array of new challenges.

The Changing Nature of the Collegiate Experience

The increasing complexity of students' backgrounds and educational goals is reflected in the varying approaches students take to higher education. El-Khawas (1996) reports that enrollment in graduate and professional degree programs is growing, as is enrollment in certificate programs of less than two years. Diverse educational goals, as well as varying life and economic circumstances, produce different attendance patterns. Part-time enrollments continue to grow, and while institutions vary in the balance of part-time and full-time enrollment, part-time students make up approximately 40% of the undergraduate enrollment (El-Khawas, 1996). Intermittent study is expected to grow as family, work, and economic resources constrain students' abilities to attend college on a continuous and regular basis. Transfers among institutions are also increasingly prevalent. Thus, higher education tends to be a part of students lives, but in many cases college attendance is not the central or defining activity of their lives. For these students, college must compete with employment and family obligations. Distance learning and increasingly sophisticated technology will also change the possibilities for engaging in higher education and the nature of the experiences encountered. Four or five years of full-time study in a residential college is no longer the most frequently traveled road to a college education.

Our Changing Understanding of How Students Learn

Both the evolving nature of society and the student body have led to reconceptualizations of learning outcomes and processes. In a postmodern society, higher education must prepare students to shoulder their moral and ethical responsibility to confront and wrestle with the complex problems they will encounter in today's and tomorrow's world. Critical, reflective thinking skills, the ability to gather and evaluate evidence, and the ability to make one's own informed judgments are essential learning outcomes if students are to get beyond relativity to make informed judgments in a world in which multiple perspectives are increasingly interdependent and "right action" is uncertain and often in dispute. Civic responsibility and productive citizenship require not only cognitive complexity but affective complexity and commitment as well. Adults' abilities to manage their own work, nurture their own families, and contribute to their communities hinges on the complexity of their thinking, feeling, and relating to others (Kegan, 1994). Holistic views of learning in which thinking, feeling, and relating to others are integrated are increasingly prevalent.

As educators, we must now recognize and respond to the fact that "intelligence" is not unidimensional, that people (including students) have "multiple intelligences" (Gardner, 1983), including, for example, linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalist "intelligences." Gardner's expansion of the concept of intelligence beyond the cognitive to the affective, social and artistic contributes to a holistic picture of learning. We must also recognize that learning is not unidimensional, that people vary in the ways in which they take in and interpret information—what Kolb (1984) calls learning styles. Students also vary with regard to how goals and expectations motivate them, their beliefs about their ability to succeed, and

the reasons to which they attribute their progress in learning (Stage, 1996).

Moreover, mounting evidence indicates that the sources of influence on students' learning are as varied and interconnected as the ways in which students learn (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). For example, not only are gains in critical thinking ability accompanied by changes in students' self-identities, self-esteem, and an array of attitudes and values, but the sources of influence on the development of critical thinking are themselves varied and interrelated. Some research (e.g., Terenzini, Springer, Pascarella, & Nora, 1994, 1995) indicates students' out-of-class experiences promote critical thinking skills independent of, and perhaps to the same degree as, students' classroom experiences. These holistic views of learning demand consideration of multiple educational outcomes that include complex cognitive skills, an ability to apply knowledge to practical problems, an appreciation of human differences, practical competence skills, and a coherent integrated sense of identity (ACPA, 1994). Recognizing that students are active participants — not passive recipients — in the learning process and in their making of meaning, that students approach this process from multiple frameworks, and that students' academic and cognitive development are shaped by their out-of-class experiences as well as their formal academic experiences all make the educational process's connection to students' experience a central component of learning (Baxter Magolda, 1992). Contemporary conversations across disciplines are focusing not only on knowledge acquisition alone, but also on the processes by which students acquire new knowledge and skills, how they make sense of the new ideas, attitudes, people, and experiences they are encountering in the college experience.

The Changing Nature of Teaching

Education reform efforts increasingly emphasize that the traditional transmission of knowledge from teacher to student is no longer sufficient for an educated citizenry. Teaching students to actively develop knowledge, to evaluate information and evidence, and to become adept at making informed decisions requires modeling these processes, engaging students in practicing them, and acknowledging students and teachers' subjectivity. Parker Palmer (1997) argues that we bring our selves to the teaching process, just as our students bring themselves to the learning process; he notes that one of the difficult truths about teaching is that it "will never take unless it connects with the inward, living core of our students lives" (p. 20). Trends in undergraduate education in the U.S. suggest some movement in perceptions of the faculty member's role in the classroom away from that of the provider of instruction to that of the facilitator of student learning (Barr & Tagg, 1995). In this conception of effective teaching, students — with the help and guidance of the faculty member — discover and learn for themselves, becoming members of learning communities as they make discoveries and solve problems. Feminist teachers advocate bringing students' ideas forward and helping develop them (e.g., Maher & Tetrault, 1994). Similarly, teachers who believe in empowering students advocate helping students analyze the forces in their lives to heighten consciousness and increase productive action (e.g., Shor, 1992). Constructivist teachers emphasize students and teachers discovering and constructing knowledge together (e.g., Twomey Fosnot, 1996). Developmental teachers recognize that students' abilities to construct knowledge hinge on their assumptions about the nature, limits, and certainty of knowledge (e.g., Baxter Magolda, in press; Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Kegan, 1993; King & Kitchener, 1994). These schools of thought all embrace the mutual interaction of students and teachers' thinking and learning. They advocate modeling learning based on using one's own experience, expanding that experience through engagement with multiple perspectives, and informed integration of multiple perspectives and existing knowledge in making one's own decisions about what to believe.

Collaboration, active engagement, and inclusion characterize these contemporary instructional approaches. Teachers and students collaborate, as do students and their peers. The traditional boundaries between the roles, responsibilities, and activities of teachers and learners are blurred, if not eliminated entirely. This collaboration takes place in learning communities in which learners respect one another and work toward common goals for everyone's success. Active engagement involves bringing one's experience to learning, being willing to expand one's understanding, integrating new perspectives into one's thinking, and applying that changed thinking to one's own life.

These forms of teaching are inclusive because they invite all students' experiences and thoughts into the learning interaction. The trend toward this type of teaching is not about particular methods but rather about the way educators view knowledge, authority, and learner capability. These trends move toward a new culture of teaching and learning (Hutchings, 1997).

Finally, how information technologies are reshaping the nature of the instructional process and with what consequences remains a little-known area. It is clear that the availability of a wide array of information technologies have significantly increased students' power and opportunities to learn under conditions with limited (if any) oversight of a faculty member. However, it is not clear how the active engagement and collaboration shown to enhance critical thinking skills might be incorporated into these technological advances. The educational consequences of technology-enhanced classrooms are as yet only little understood.

The Changing Nature of Outcomes Assessment

Trends in learning outcomes and teaching practices have produced changes in our conceptions and methods of outcomes assessment. The dynamic nature of contemporary forms of teaching and learning require on-going assessment, which is increasingly viewed as an integral part of the teaching-learning process, as a feedback mechanism for teachers and learners alike, not merely an administrative add-on for accountability purposes. Perhaps the most prevalent example of continual assessment is Angelo and Cross' (1993) classroom assessment techniques that help teacher and learner gauge the degree to which they understand each other. Assessment as a continuous process represents a significant conceptual shift that extends beyond a focus on outcomes to examination of the underlying conditions for learning (Hutchings, 1989). It also represents an explicit shift from individual courses or programs and their outcomes to how teaching affects the cumulative understandings of students. Assessing knowledge gains will no longer be sufficient; outcomes in critical thinking, cultural understanding, empathy, citizenship, and social responsibility will also be important (Astin, 1996). Hutchings argues that we need "assessment predicated on a view of learning that is integrated and multi-dimensional" (1989, p. 29). Students' potential for independent learning after college is another intended outcome of the new approaches to teaching and learning and a worthy object for assessment (Wingspread Group, 1993). Assessment must also acknowledge the impact of environment and climate on student learning (Astin, 1996).

Implications for Practice

The overriding implication of these trends is that conventional assumptions about students, the collegiate experience, learning, teaching, and assessment will not serve higher education well in the 21st century. Collectively, the trends clearly require educators (i.e., faculty members and administrators alike) to re-examine — and probably transform — current assumptions about the ways we engage learners in the educational process. This re-examination must carefully scrutinize beliefs about who our students are, how they learn, their level of preparation, other demands being made on their time and attention (e.g., family and work), and their educational and occupational goals. The re-examination must also extend to current beliefs about the roles and responsibilities of teachers and learners, the learning/teaching process and how it can best be facilitated, and how we can create and sustain significant educational communities. Similarly, the re-examination must also include serious exploration of ways to minimize, if not eliminate, the current organizational bifurcation of academic and student affairs. Structurally and functionally, the present boundaries must be blurred to reflect the *joint and synergistic* effects of students' in- and out-of-class experiences on learning.

The increasing heterogeneity of the undergraduate student bodies on most college and university campuses will require far more targeted educational interventions than we now have. Dogged persistence in delivering education in the same way we've offered it in the past is unlikely to be productive. The research increasingly reminds us that one size does not fit all, that what is educationally effective for some students may not be so effective for other kinds of students. We must first understand — and accept — who our students are and then move to provide instructional experiences in and outside the classroom tailored to meet those students' learning needs.

Such educational tailoring requires recognition of the fact that learning is holistic, connected to learners'

lives, and characterized by multiple intelligences and ways of knowing. That recognition, in turn, requires new pedagogical assumptions. Constructivist pedagogy necessitates respecting students' ways of knowing and learning and incorporating them into the educational process. Further, it emphasizes active and collaborative learning, as well as respecting learners as adults with relevant experience who, with guidance, are capable of making informed judgments about what to believe. In active and collaborative learning settings, teachers—both faculty and student affairs professionals—become guides, collaborators, and facilitators rather than omniscient authorities (the "guide-on-the-side" vs. the "sage on the stage"). Teaching and learning become integrated and interactive processes, no longer the traditional, instructor-centered, "I pitch; you catch." approach to knowledge transmission. In its place is a learner-centered view of informed knowledge construction among teachers and learners. This shift is not merely a modification of current teaching techniques (e.g., adding group work or unstructured activity to a predominantly lecture-driven course). It is a fundamental transformation of assumptions about learners, teachers, and the kinds of interactions that lead to knowledge and skill acquisition and learning.

Teachers and students learning together implies transforming assumptions about instructional effectiveness, the role of teaching in faculty life, and the role of educator in student affairs. Assessment becomes a matter of gauging progress over time—what Pat Hutchings characterizes as producing a movie rather than a snapshot—to reflect the complexity of holistic learning. Rather than focusing strictly on outcomes, assessment helps create the conditions for learning. Such a conception of assessment will require an extension of the current "pre- and post-program" assessment model to a view of assessment as data gathering and analysis on an on-going basis. Such a more "continuous" model will involve estimation not only of *whether* learning and development have occurred, but also *when*. Similarly (if such assessments are to be cost-effective), the "continuous assessment" model will require estimation of the magnitude of the effects of an intervention. It will no longer be adequate to determine whether an educational intervention has a statistically significant effect. Assessments must be able to answer questions about whether an intervention has had a "large enough" impact to be pedagogically or administratively significant and worth the continued investment of scarce resources (Terenzini & Pascarella, 1991).

As our understanding of effective teaching becomes increasingly complex, faculty will need opportunities for dialogue about teaching and rewards for focusing on teaching. Teaching must become "community property" (Shulman, 1993), and systems such as centers for teaching excellence or peer review (Hutchings, 1994) are needed to support faculty in these efforts. Reward systems will also have to be re-examined and restructured to promote the design and implementation of new curricular and pedagogical initiatives the trends outlined above will require. Similarly, student affairs professionals will need opportunities for dialogue about their role in the educational process; administrative reward systems and structures will need transformation to focus on student learning rather than on student services. Dialogue among faculty and student affairs professionals on effective collaboration in promoting student learning will be essential. Nothing less than a systemic change in current academic and institutional cultures will be needed (Ewell, 1997).

The trends also imply transforming assumptions about students' role in the campus community. Just as new forms of pedagogy call for partnerships with learners, partnerships within the educational community will also be needed. Because many of tomorrow's learners will be adults who balance educational goals with family and professional priorities, collaboratively developing flexible enrollment, advising, and learning options with them will be necessary. Mutually determining appropriate counseling opportunities may be needed given the diversity of prior experiences and multiple roles students bring to campus. Colleges and universities will have to be more open to differences, embracing multiple perspectives in program content, educational practice, and campus service options. The primary change here is from educational practice determined solely by faculty and staff to a joint partnership in which teaching and learning takes advantage of the expertise, experience, and intellectual curiosity of faculty, staff, *and students* alike.

For student affairs professionals, the emergence of distance learning has particularly significant implications. The characteristics of students, their needs, and their learning styles that have defined traditional and

still-dominant academic and student services' models (which assume students are largely in-residence, accessible on a known schedule, and relatively homogeneous with respect to their academic and personal development goals) are changing. In an "asynchronous learning environment," instruction is delivered at a distance, at a time and place of the learner's choosing, and to learners who are decidedly different from "traditional students." They represent a dramatic contrast and a formidable challenge. They come from vastly different backgrounds, with vastly different learning needs and goals, pursue a college degree or certificate in a fashion significantly different from that of traditional students, and will earn their degrees on a "virtual" campus, far from the residential — even commuter — campuses most student affairs divisions are designed to serve. Such an environment will require re-evaluation of the entire panoply of traditional student affairs activities and services as they relate to this student-body-at-a-distance. How student affairs professionals respond to the challenges of serving students in a virtual world and as part of an asynchronous learning environment may well define the profession's future. [M. Lee Upcraft and Patrick T. Terenzini, in their paper for this ACPA Senior Scholars series, entitled "Technology," provide a fuller discussion of the potential effects of distance learning on student affairs.]

Finally, the changing characteristics of students and what we know about how, when, and where they learn requires re-examination of assumptions underlying our current organizational structures and lines of administrative communication and cooperation. The available evidence clearly indicates that colleges and universities are not currently organized in ways that promote optimal student learning. Indeed, what we know about how students learn and how we organize our institutions have little in common (Terenzini & Pascarella, 1994). The fact that about 85% of students' waking hours are spent outside the classroom (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, et al., 1991), and that an increasing number of students are enrolled part-time, clearly suggest the need to maximize the opportunities colleges and universities have for enhancing students' learning. Service learning, internships, community service, and employment offer important opportunities to link students' out-of-class lives and experiences with what they are studying and learning in more formal instructional settings. More such linkages must be found, and institutional and administrative structures and policies, and status structures must be reshaped to encourage collaboration across academic and student affairs divisional lines. Both have the enhancement of student learning as their major objective, and they will have to function and cooperate accordingly to have the greatest impact.

Implications for Research

Significant advances have been made in the past 10-15 years in the research on how students learn and the characteristics of effective teaching. Another section in this collection of papers outlines a number of potentially fruitful research questions on teaching and learning for the coming decade. These questions deal with the characteristics of the learner and educators (broadly defined), the conditions for effective learning, and the development and effectiveness of learning communities. In this section, we identify several broad considerations we believe it will be important for scholars to address as they pursue their particular research agenda on teaching and student learning.

First, we believe several *topical areas* merit particular attention:

- Changes in the learning-related attitudes and values of today's students
- The college experiences and outcomes of part-time and low-income students
- How students "make meaning" — the mechanisms they use to structure knowledge
- The contributions of students' non-classroom experiences to cognitive development
- Classroom, program, departmental, and institutional structures, practices, and policies that promote learning
- State policies that promote or impede increased faculty and institutional emphasis on student learning
- The nature of the learning experiences and its educational consequences in "distance" learning settings

We also believe scholars should consider the following issues as they select study topics and plan their research:

- The timing of significant student learning: *When* does it occur?

- The magnitude of change: *How much* do students change as a consequence of any specific educational experience or the college experience as a whole?
- What are the multiple forces shaping any particular kind of learning? Research designs that focus on specific experiences (e.g., place of residence while in college, a particular instructional method, a specific out-of-class experience) as if they operated independently of other dimensions of students' lives are unlikely to be particularly informative or useful.
- Is the effect of any given college experience general (i.e., it affects all students to about the same degree) or condition (i.e., the effect depends on the characteristics of the student, such as gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, ability)?

The next decade offers higher education researchers significant challenges in both the complexity of the topics and the need for methodological rigor. But equally significant opportunities also exist. The sophistication of our knowledge of how students learn and how we can promote that learning has never been greater. The need for increased sophistication has never been stronger. The stakes for colleges and universities — and for undergraduate education — have never been higher.

References

American College Personnel Association. (1994). *The student learning imperative*. Washington DC: Author.

Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers (2nd edition)*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1996). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 123-133.

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, November/December, 13-25.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1992). *Knowing and reasoning in college: Gender-related patterns in students' intellectual development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (in press). *Creating contexts for learning and self-authorship: Constructive-developmental pedagogy*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic Books.

Carter, D. & Wilson, R. (1995). *Thirteenth annual status report on minorities in higher education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

El-Khawas, E. (1996). Student diversity on today's campuses. In S. Komives and D. Woodard (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession, 3rd edition* (pp. 64-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ewell, P. T. (1997). Organizing for learning. *AAHE Bulletin*, December, 3-6.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Hutchings, P. (1989). *Behind outcomes: Contexts and questions for assessment*. Washington DC: AAHE Assessment Forum.

Hutchings, P. (1994). Peer review of teaching: "From idea to prototype." *AAHE Bulletin*, November, 3-7.

Hutchings, P. (1997, November/December). Building a new culture of teaching and learning. *About Campus*, 4-8.

Kegan, R. (1993). Minding the curriculum: Of student epistemology and faculty conspiracy. In A. Garrod (Ed.), *Approaches to moral development: New research and emerging themes* (pp. 72-88). New York: Teachers College Press.

Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). *Developing Reflective Judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E., & Associates. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A., & Cureton, J. S. (1998). *When hope and fear collide: A portrait of today's college student.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Maher, F.A., & Tetrault, M. K. (Eds.). (1994). *The feminist classroom: An inside look at how professors and students are transforming higher education for a diverse society.* New York: Basic Books.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1994). *Digest of educational statistics.* Washington DC: Author.

Palmer, P. J. (1997, November/December). The heart of a teacher: Identity and integrity in teaching. *Change*, 15-21.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Shulman, L. S. (1993). Teaching as community property: Putting an end to pedagogical solitude. *Change*, November/December, 6-7.

Stage, F. (1996). Setting the context: Psychological theories of learning. *Journal of College Student Development, 37* (2), pp. 227-235.

Terenzini, P. T., & Pascarella, E. T. (1991). Twenty years of research on college students: Lessons for future research. *Research in Higher Education, 32*, 83-92.

Terenzini, P. T., & Pascarella, E. T. (1994, January/February). Living with myths: Undergraduate education in America. *Change*, 28-32.

Terenzini, P. T., Rendon, L. I., Upcraft, M. L., Millar, S. B., Allison, K. W., Gregg, P. L., & Jalomo, R. (1994). The transition to college: Diverse students, diverse stories. *Research in Higher Education, 35*, 57-73.

Terenzini, P. T., Springer, L., Pascarella, E. T., & Nora, A. (1994, November). The multiple influences on college students' critical thinking skills. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Study of Higher Education, Tucson, AZ.

Terenzini, P. T., Springer, L., Pascarella, E. T., & Nora, A. (1995). Influences affecting the development of students' critical thinking skills. *Research in Higher Education, 36*, 23-39.

Terenzini, P. T., Springer, L., Yaeger, P., Pascarella, E. T., & Nora, A. (1996). First-generation college students: Characteristics, experiences, and cognitive development. *Research in Higher Education, 37*, 1-22.

Tierney, W. G. (1993). *Building communities of difference: Higher education in the twenty-first century.* Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Twomey Fosnot, C. (Ed.). (1996). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Upcraft, M. L. (1994). Teaching and today's changing college students. In R. J. Menges & M. Weimer (Eds.), *Teaching on solid ground: Using scholarship to improve practice* (pp. 21-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education. (1993). *An American imperative.* The Johnson Foundation.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ON

Learning and Teaching in the 21st Century

Marcia Baxter Magolda, Professor
Educational Leadership
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

Patrick T. Terenzini, Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Pennsylvania State University,
University Park, Pennsylvania

Trends in learning and teaching clearly portend significant changes for the 21st century, and the directions of change are evident. However, it is less obvious how educators might go about changing long-standing assumptions, acquire new knowledge about diverse students and their learning, and develop new practice based on both. The questions that follow offer rich areas for study to guide learning and teaching practice in the next century. Many of the questions ask about "interaction effects," the extent to which an educational intervention may have a different effect on some students than on others depending on the characteristics of the student (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, ability, socioeconomic status).

What Do Learners Bring to Learning?

1. How do students' pre-college characteristics and experiences (e.g., family, community, schooling) affect learning in college?
2. Do cultural, ethnic, racial, gender, and class dynamics differentially affect learning?
3. What are the multiple conceptions of knowing, learning styles, learning abilities, intelligences, and levels of development that students possess? How do these mediate learning in particular disciplines and in general?
4. What possible profiles can be generated to describe the multiple goals, priorities, and purposes of tomorrow's students?
5. What assumptions about knowledge, learning, and teaching do college students bring from their prior schooling and experience? How changeable are these assumptions?

What Do Educators (i.e., Faculty and Administrators) Bring to Educational Practice?

1. How does prior experience as a learner and/or educator shape one's approach to educational practice?
2. What are the multiple versions of knowing, learning style, learning ability, intelligences, and development that educators possess? How do these mediate educational practice?
3. How does one's cultural, ethnic, racial, gender, and class status affect one's educational beliefs and practices?
4. What assumptions about knowledge, learning and teaching do educators hold? How changeable are these assumptions?
5. To what extent are educators clear on the learning goals for their particular educational practices?
6. What are the goals and priorities of educators in their particular practice?
7. To what extent do educators understand or have access to knowledge about diverse characteristics of students and their impact on learning?

What Are the Conditions for Learning?

1. Numerous conditions for meaningful learning that lead to the self-authorship needed in the next century have been summarized above. What forms do these conditions take in particular contexts? How do educators identify additional conditions for meaningful learning particular to their context?
2. How do conditions for learning differ given students' holistic development, learning styles, learning abilities, and cultural backgrounds?

3. What is the process for helping educators and learners alter conventional assumptions to facilitate new forms of learning and teaching? What support is needed? What strategies are effective for addressing resistance?

4. What educational practices that take holistic learning into account appear to be the most effective?

5. What *administrative features* (e.g., structures, policies, practices, faculty and student reward systems) are best able to accommodate new attendance patterns, multiple educational goals, and new ways of teaching and learning?

6. What *curricular structures* appear to be best able to accommodate new attendance patterns, multiple educational goals, new ways of teaching and learning, and multiple perspectives?

7. What decision-making practices and models best encourage effective learner partnerships?

8. Which contemporary forms of teaching (e.g., developmental, feminist, constructivist) most effectively promote "deep learning"? Do they work equally well for students with varying ways of knowing, learning styles, intelligences, abilities, and cultural backgrounds?

9. How can educators engage students in multiple perspectives yet not foster relativity?

10. What strategies are effective in removing the effects of negative background experiences as obstacles to learning (e.g., learning disabilities, experience with violence, or experience in a dysfunctional family?

11. What strategies are effective for using on-going assessment to improve conditions for meaningful learning? What assessment tools are most useful in dealing with the complexity of learners and the learning process?

12. What strategies are effective for communicating and explaining new approaches to learning to students, administrators, and external constituents? What approaches will work to garner support for these new forms of teaching and learning?

13. How does the "technology-rich" classroom affect student learning? How does it alter the nature of student-student and student-faculty interaction and with what educational consequences?

14. How, if at all, do the nature and outcomes of the experience of learning at a distance differ from those of face-to-face, residential instructional setting?

On Creating Learning Communities

1. The trends collectively demonstrate the need for what Tierney (1993) calls communities of difference for the next century. How are communities that respect and value difference and multiple perspectives created? How are such communities maintained?

2. How do educators learn to shift from autonomous functioning to collaborative functioning among themselves and with students? What support is needed? What strategies are effective to address resistance?

3. How do students learn to shift from autonomous functioning to collaborative functioning among themselves and with educators? What support is needed? What strategies are effective to address resistance?

4. How do educators and students learn to participate effectively in creative controversy to consider multiple perspectives?

5. Under what conditions are students willing to engage in pursuing multiple perspectives, particularly ones that differ from their own? What support is needed?

6. The process of racial identity has been described for various racial and ethnic groups, including Whites. How is growth to the more complex stages of racial identity (in which difference is valued) promoted? In what ways can this be integrated into the collegiate experience?

7. What mechanisms are effective for educators to study their own racial identity development and its impact on educational practice? What support is needed?

8. Which out-of-class experiences are the most effective in promoting academic and cognitive learning outcomes?

9. Which forms of academic and student affairs divisional collaboration are the most effective in promoting students' academic and cognitive development?

LOOKING BEYOND THE HORIZON: TRENDS SHAPING STUDENT AFFAIRS

TECHNOLOGY

M. Lee Upcraft, Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Pennsylvania State University,
University Park, Pennsylvania

Patrick T. Terenzini, Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Pennsylvania State University,
University Park, Pennsylvania

In Consultation with
Kevin Kruger
Associate Executive Director
National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

Item: A leading educator enthusiastically pronounces that computer technology is the greatest communications and educational revolution since the invention of the printing press in the 15th century.

Item: A skeptical educator predicts that computer technology will go the way of educational television, a much heralded innovation whose potential withered away because of the basic need for face-to-face human interaction.

Item: Many progressive day care centers are offering computer classes to children as young as three years old.

Is the technological revolution a journey to higher levels of human experience, or a gigantic leap into the abyss of total mechanization of the human race? Or will it be neither? And no matter how it turns out, what does it all mean for higher education and student affairs? This paper identifies some of the basic technology-related trends in higher education and discusses the implications of these trends for student affairs.

Let us first stipulate that neither of us is a "techie." Our level of expertise on computer technology is quickly exhausted after e-mail, voice mail, word processing, and surfing the Net. We are, however, concerned about the introduction and advancement of technology into campus life and its unexamined potential for changing learning and the quality of students' education. We are also disturbed that much of this technology is being embraced uncritically, with little or no analysis of its potential consequences, for good and for ill.

Trends in Technology in Higher Education

We cannot even begin to identify all the ways in which technology has influenced the daily lives of students, faculty, and our institutions. We can, however, identify a few technology related "megatrends" to serve as a basis for raising questions about their impact on higher education, student learning, and student affairs.

Trend 1: **An increased reliance on technology in students' classroom experiences.**

Item: With classroom technologies such as desktop groupware conferencing, teacher/student interaction may take place in real time, asynchronously, or both.

Item: At many institutions, large classes are being technologically "downsized" through guided discussion software and campus computer network applications.

In spite of the fact that a majority of today's college classrooms are still dominated by the traditional lecture/discussion method, more and more technological innovations are gaining hold in the classroom. They range from very basic but limited use of technology (using e-mail for communication and feedback, course Web pages, and course chat rooms) to enhancements of the traditional classroom (using presentation software such as PowerPoint, and computer simulations) to virtual classrooms using one-way and two-way audio-visual techniques, computer groupware conferencing, computer video and asynchronous computer

conferencing, and asynchronous/CD-ROM hybrids (Van Dusen, 1997). Technology also provides an opportunity to cross inter-institutional barriers to allow for an open class discussion across the Internet with students from other campuses, or in other countries. In all these cases, however, students' face to face contact with faculty, student affairs professionals, and peers is altered, reduced, or eliminated, with at present unknown consequences for student learning and development.

Trend 2: **Increased reliance on technology in students' out-of-class experiences.**

Item: A university on the cutting edge of technology proudly announces a plan to place two computers in every residence hall room, enabling residents to pursue their education through the vast potential of the Internet.

Item: A leading educator warns of the dire, negative consequences of "cocooning": students retreating to the isolation of their computers to avoid campus and course involvement, and instead sinking into self-gratifying Internet entertainment and addiction.

The impact of technology on student life is no less impressive. Students have come to expect computer accessibility on their campuses and in their lives. Accessibility ranges from campus computer labs to computers in every residence hall room to requiring or providing computers for all students. The technology is rapidly moving toward wireless telecommunications networks on campuses (like cellular networks) that will permit laptop access to all computer services literally from anywhere in the world anytime. Using computers for information retrieval for course preparation, reading assignments, and assigned papers is now possible, not to mention the entertainment, chat rooms, web pages, and social communication that computers provide. One's circle of friends is now easily expanded electronically to include literally the world. Opportunities now exist for live, and real-time Internet discussions of significant campus issues and controversial campus speakers.

Trend 3: **Increased reliance on technology in administrative and support services.**

Item: At California State University's newest campus at Monterey Bay, one building is conspicuously absent from their blueprints: the library. This campus will instead rely instead on technology for information retrieval.

Item: The University of Wisconsin System Collaborative Nursing Program offers most of its programs, including academic advising, through distance education technology. When asked to evaluate the quality of advising they received, 71% said the quality of distance education advising was the same as other advising they had previously received; the other 29% said it was better.

Hardly any aspect of student support services remains untouched by technology. For example, it is now possible at some institutions for students to seek admissions information, apply for admission, and be admitted entirely on-line. Telephone, on-line, or web registration for courses is now commonplace on many campuses. As cited above, academic advising can now be done with multiple technologies. E-mail has revolutionized our day-to-day work communications. Information needed for administrative functions that were once carefully secured and mostly unavailable are now only a keystroke away for most of us. Budgets are projected, administered, and accounted for by computer assisted technology.

Trend 4: **The growth of distance/virtual education.**

Item: The Western Governors' University, with its cyberspace campus and virtual classrooms, has taken the first steps toward full accreditation. Many campuses, states, and regions are developing "virtual" campuses.

Item: The former president of a major research university predicts that within ten years, students will spend only about half their time on his campus; the rest will be spent in field experiences combined with distance education courses.

More and more students can now access courses or even entire academic programs without ever setting foot on a campus. The Western Governors' University, cited above, is one of many well- known attempts to create a virtual university, although some individual institutions are proceeding with their versions of a "World University." Advocates suggest that as time and space barriers to an education are removed, it is no longer necessary for students, faculty, and administrators to gather at the same time or in the same place for

teaching and learning to occur. Accessibility to higher education will be expanded because, according to these advocates, any person who is qualified will no longer be excluded because of time and place constraints. On the other hand, no one seems to be asking the questions, what student services and programs are necessary in distance education and how if at all, should they be delivered differently than in more traditional educational settings?

Trend 5: **The virtual impossibility of keeping up with technological innovations.**

> **Item:** A leading computer expert estimates that today's state of the art desktop computer will be obsolete within 2 years; for laptops, obsolescence comes within 9 months.

A few of us believe that advances in computer technology are a vast conspiracy by computer and software manufacturers to maintain a steady and increasing revenue stream. Even if that's a bit cynical, all of us have experienced the frustration of installing computer hardware and software only to find that within what seems to be a very unreasonable time, what we purchased is obsolete or outdated. Today's Cadillac is tomorrow's Edsel. And there seems to be no end in sight, creating enormous problems for students and their institutions. Students without state of the art technology are disadvantaged; institutions without resources to upgrade cannot compete.

At least one thing seems clear: Information technologies are dramatically reshaping the way instruction is delivered and business is done on college and university campuses. Whether we realize it or not, they are also reshaping the world of student affairs — for better or worse. The nature of those effects, however, remains unclear. Distance education may represent the most dramatic force for change, but other technologies will also have their impact.

As we look at the evolution of student affairs, one of the most salient features is a progressive loss of control over the time and place of its activities. From the founding of the earliest residential colleges, institutional authorities (faculty and staff alike) have had substantial control over students' lives and what happened to them both in and out of the classroom. Throughout the 300-plus year history of American higher education, institutions remained largely in control of when and where students encountered the educational experiences intended to promote their cognitive and psychosocial development. Educational interventions (with a few exceptions) took place on an institution's campus. Students came together on that site (or on other sites controlled by the institution) to engage in intellectual and personal learning. The institution controlled where those interactions took place and when: application, admission, registration, orientation, academic advising, instruction, faculty office hours, formal out-of-class interventions by student affairs professionals — all took place at scheduled times. And the schedule was controlled by representatives of the institution.

Around the turn of the century, however, the hegemony of the residential college began to erode as community and commuter colleges offered educational opportunities not only to more people, but also to students who were on campus for more limited periods of time. The GI Bill and subsequent federal legislation dramatically altered the nature of the student body, introducing significant numbers of "non-traditional" students whose educational interests and goals differed in important ways from those of traditional students (and most of the changes affected student affairs more directly than other sectors of our colleges and universities). The demise of in *loco parentis* radically altered the legal relationship between students and their institutions, and student affairs has not been quite the same since. For example, advances in distance education have the potential to transform the philosophy, definition, structure, and activities of student affairs in ways far more consequential and far-reaching than did the legal challenges to *in loco parentis*. The emergence of technology-mediated distance education on the educational scene may well extend access to the academic elements of postsecondary education to more people, but its impact on student affairs is more cloudy. Following are some of the important questions we believe advances in technology pose for higher education in general and student affairs in particular:

1. **How will the philosophy and goals of student affairs be affected?**

   From its inception, student affairs has been concerned with the development of the whole student — both the cognitive and affective dimensions of the student. Indeed, a number of thinkers and writers in stu-

dent affairs are calling for an end to the bifurcation of the student into "cognitive" and "affective" dimensions, arguing that student learning is an intricate web of experiences and consequences for learning that cannot be meaningfully disentangled. There are calls to "blur the boundaries" between academic and student affairs, for collaboration across divisional lines and for the integration of students' in- and out-of-class experiences.

Computer technology, however, has the potential to bifurcate rather than integrate. In an "asynchronous learning environment" with "anywhere-anytime learning," not to mention "just in time learning" what is to be the role of student affairs? How is the full development — psychosocial as well as academic and intellectual — to be promoted in a purposeful, integrated, mutually reinforcing environment or set of experiences? It seems to us that computer technology may pose a significant threat to the goals and educational effectiveness of "involving colleges" (Kuh, et al., 1991) *unless* it is reconceived in ways that will accommodate a broader conception of "student learning," or student affairs can develop new ways to promote those goals. Will the goals traditionally espoused by student affairs professionals be judged no longer worthwhile, relevant, or important elements of postsecondary "education"? Will those goals be achievable in an asynchronous learning environment?

2. **What will be the frequency and nature of students' interactions with faculty members, other students, and student affairs professionals?**

A significant body of empirical evidence indicates that some of the most powerful educational forces in higher education are faculty members and other students (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Research consistently points to students' interactions with faculty members (inside and outside the classroom) and with peers as powerful, positive influences on a wide array of educationally desirable outcomes. One writer, however, identifies the absence or quasi-permanent absence of a peer group as a salient feature of "distance education" (Keegan, 1990). How will both the opportunities for, and the nature of, those interactions be changed in asynchronous learning environments? What will be the consequences for student learning and development? Will those interactions cease? Be reduced/increased in number? Changed in nature? Or will those interactions simply occur in different forms and through different mechanisms?

3. **How will traditional organizational structures and activities have to be altered in order to enhance the kinds of student learning and development that faculty and student affairs professionals work to promote?**

Virtually from the very beginning, residence halls have been recognized as educationally useful places. While the colonial colleges may have viewed them primarily as mechanisms for controlling the non-academic lives of students, residence halls were subsequently recognized as places for powerful (controlled and uncontrolled) learning. What will become of the residence hall and its learning potential in an asynchronous environment? Can the friendship groups that develop, and the opportunities they afford students to encounter new and different people and ideas, be somehow recreated in cyberspace? Can virtual residence hall floors or suites be developed?

What about student organizations and activities? Can student internships, service learning, and volunteer community service activities be promoted in an asynchronous learning environment? What of opportunities for students to develop leadership skills?

Perhaps more important from students' points of view, what about parties, drinking with friends, entertainment events, cultural activities, and (gasp) the glorious experience of sitting with their fellow undergraduates in a football stadium on a sunny Saturday afternoon in October?

4. **How can the disadvantages of the application of computer technology in most student affairs learning settings be overcome?**

The easy answer from the techies among us is that we will create "virtual" experiences which will compensate for the los of "real" experiences. One can imagine many "virtual" possibilities, including "virtual" advising, "virtual" floor meetings in residence halls, "virtual" student government meetings, chat rooms designed for peer group interaction, and interactive programs to facilitate faculty-student interaction. But for many, particularly those of us who did not grow up in the electronic age, these "virtual" solutions are a poor substitute for the real thing. Or are they? It is certainly

possible that students who grew up in the electronic age will not have the same reservations about "virtual" interactions and will welcome the breadth of interaction and other advantages that can result.

5. What is the cost of technological innovations, and how will we afford them?

This is perhaps the most important question of all: Is technology worth it? Technology costs a lot of money. It also has the potential of saving a lot of money, although there is scant systematic evidence that institutions have saved anything. The short "half life" of up-to-date equipment also exacerbates the financial pressures. In the technology area, we are long on claims and short on evidence when it comes to cost-benefit analyses.

So, how does technology get funded? Sometimes additional institutional resources are used, sometimes external sources are found, but most often technology is funded "within existing resources." That may mean using the projected savings of a technological advance, but more often than not it means reducing personnel, programs, and services. The result is that institutions and departments with greater resources are often able to afford technological advances, making the rich richer, and the poor poorer in comparison. Thus, students' accessibility to educational technology may be different, depending upon which institution or department they choose; and, thus, many individuals and institutions may become educational disadvantaged.

Implications for Student Affairs Policy and Practice

Let's assume, for the sake of argument, however, that the basic need for humans to interact face-to-face will survive the "virtual" revolution, and that the brave new world will be some combination of real and virtual interactions. What will be the implications for student affairs? We can only speculate, of course, but we see at least five issues worth considering.

First, for our students who are on campus, traditional means of delivering services and programs will be enhanced by technology, particularly at the administrative support level. Information previously communicated through written materials will be accessed by electronic means. Managing budgets, scheduling of facilities, keeping records, admitting students, protecting the safety and security of the campus will all be enhanced and improved through technology. Certainly, technology has the potential of creating fewer administrative barriers, like on-line residence hall repair requests, handling housing assignments, using smart card technology to conduct university business, and other applications.

Second, students who spend part of their time engaged in field experiences away from campus, or earn their entire degrees without ever setting foot on our campuses, present a much more difficult challenge. They may require different services and programs, delivered in different ways. For example, students doing an internship in an inner city, or studying alone in their home, will need electronic information links to their campus. They may also need to know how to access local services for counseling, recreational activities, cultural events, housing, transportation, and other needs. We must be prepared, then, to meet student needs wherever they are.

Third, and perhaps most difficult, is how to compensate for the lack of peer interaction. Our literature is filled with evidence that much of how students grow and develop in college, and how they much they learn, is affected by peer interaction. As student affairs professionals, we rely very heavily on peer group influence to implement our educational goals. Take away the peer group, our argument goes, and our ability to influence students, and students' ability to influence each other is sharply reduced or eliminated. We don't have answers, just questions: Are there ways of reconstituting peer interactions in the electronic age? Should we have a residence requirement (at least one semester) for all students, regardless of their location? What do we do when that is impossible, as in the case of an Indonesian student taking distance education courses electronically from an American University? Can we create "virtual" peer groups to compensate for the lack of in person interpersonal interaction? Or are we just overreacting? Maybe the loss of in person interpersonal interaction will have little or no effect on learning outcomes, in which case we should stop worrying.

Fourth, there is the issue of access. Technology has the potential to create "haves and have-nots," putting women, minorities, and the economically disadvantaged behind the technology curve. We must ensure that anyone without the financial means or the com-

puter literacy to access information technology can fully participate in the information revolution. Komives and Petersen (1997) argue that institutions must ask themselves several important questions: Who will be disadvantaged (and advantaged) by a policy that requires universal computer access? How will institutions ensure access to the economically disadvantaged? How will computer ownership affect the mission of the institution and the student affairs role in enhancing and supporting the academic mission? What interventions will be necessary to compensate for different levels of computer literacy? Similar equity questions apply at the institutional level. Will poorer institutions (which tend to serve the nation's poor) also be disadvantaged? We assert unequivocally that **no student should be at a learning disadvantage because of his/her inability to afford technology, or because the institution he/she attends does not have technology support.**

Fifth, legal/ethical issues must be addressed. Certainly confidentiality of e-mail, definitions of harassment by computer, and the limits of access to obscenity and pornography are among the issues which must be addressed in the context of our constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech. In the free space of the Internet, how are we to deal with this dilemma? For example, what remedies can institutions provide for students who experience on-line harassment? Further, as information is proliferated on the Web, in the spirit of free information for all, how will colleges protect intellectual property and define "fair use"? And equally as important, with no monitoring of the accuracy of information on the Web, who will determine the reliability and validity of information available?

In conclusion, there are many challenges in the coming electronic age in higher education. To date, there has been little discussion, and even less research on the impact of technology on student learning and development, and on the implications for student affairs. We need both, and soon, if we are to remain relevant to students' education. We must ensure that we are partners with other administrators and faculty in developing policies which define the role of technology in higher education. If we fail to do so, others will define our role, or leave us out altogether. Neither of those alternatives will benefit students.

Authors' Note: *We gratefully acknowledge the invaluable advice and suggestions provided by Kevin Kruger, Associate Executive Director, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA).*

References

Komives, S. R. & Petersen, R. J. (1997). "Values and principles guiding technology decision making for the future." From Engstrom, C. M. and Kruger, K. W., *Using Technology to Promote Student Learning: Opportunities for Today and Tomorrow*, New Directions for Student Services Number 78, Summer. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Van Dusen, Gerald C. (1997). *The Virtual Campus: Technology and Reform in Higher Education*, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Volume 25, Number 5. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ON

Technology

M. Lee Upcraft, Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Pennsylvania State University,
University Park, Pennsylvania

Patrick T. Terenzini, Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Pennsylvania State University,
University Park, Pennsylvania

1. What is the impact of technology on the nature and extent of student learning, both inside and outside the classroom?
2. What is the impact of technology on student affairs administrative and support services, and their dealings with students and families?
3. What are the implications of technology for graduate training programs in student affairs?
4. What is the impact of technology on the campus environment and student culture?
5. What student services and programs are needed in distance education, and how, if at all, should they be delivered different than in more traditional educational settings?
6. How, if at all, is the traditional "whole student" philosophy and goals of student affairs changed by the emergence of technology?
7. How, if at all, is technology affecting the frequency and nature of students' interactions with faculty members, other students, and student affairs professionals?
8. What are the legal/ethical implications of the presence of technology?
9. Is technology's impact different depending on its institutional availability and student accessibility?

The Changing Nature of Work in Higher Education

Susan R. Komives, Associate Professor
Counseling and Personnel Services
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

One of the outcomes of rapid change has been the need to examine and redesign the nature of work in higher education. This reconceptualization has been driven by technology, financial hardship, sharpened mission statements, new forms of accountability, changing student characteristics, and a recentering on student learning. This conceptualization has happened both accidentally and intentionally, through thoughtful as well as reactionary processes, and it has probed deeper and deeper into the core of the roles that support the purposes of higher education. The outcomes of this reconceptualization are fraught with promise and peril. The best of traditional work roles in higher education (i.e., teacher, advisor, counselor) must be preserved while concurrently renewing and reframing those roles for today's complex times.

This paper will primarily examine some of the broader trends in the changing nature of work in higher education. In addition, it will present some implications of these trends on student affairs practice and pose some lines of research inquiry to examine the changing nature of work and work roles.

The Evolving Trends

Higher education seems faced with a dynamic tension caused by the restraining forces of decades of tradition being confronted by the driving forces of rapid change. Current trends of change seem to be probing the very core of who does what work in higher education, what that work is and how it is rewarded, how and when that work is accomplished, and where it happens. Different campus environments certainly experience a different emphasis (e.g., community colleges have used many ongoing part-time faculty for years while this practice is newly expanding at research universities).

These changing trends in the nature of work in higher education include the following:

Higher Education Is Moving Toward a More Adaptable Work Force

The rapid pace of change, the expansion of knowledge, and the increasing demands for technological competence create a press for enhanced work force adaptability. Technology alone has brought many of these changes creating an impact on the very nature of all forms of work in higher education. For example, teaching takes new forms in distance learning and traditional student services have to be reframed for those in off site locations.

Work force adaptability has also taken the form of changing the nature of how employees are attached to the institution. Increased uses of a contingent work force have brought a more transient group of employees. The American Council on Education (El-Khawas & Knopp, 1996) reported that nearly half of all institutions make "extensive use" of part-time faculty for more than one-fourth of their courses; this trend is particularly apparent in almost three-fourths of all community colleges (p. 15). Part time faculty, contract staff, and seasonal classified staff clearly have less knowledge about the institution and thereby contribute to a lack of continuity of service and to diminished institutional loyalty. Conversely, the institution is seen as less loyal to this contingent work force.

The 1990s emphasis on strategic planning, visioning, accountability, re-engineering, environmental scanning, and continuous quality improvement have clearly influenced institutions to become more adaptive to change. Many liberal arts colleges and research universities now seek a higher capacity for flexibility — more

like community colleges who have been more adaptable since inception.

Technology Is Changing Everything

Every single area of campus is touched by technology. New work communications include voice mail, menu choice automated messages, integrated data bases, records accessible by computer, electronic mail, web site course readings, web site services, and tele-commuting to mention just a few. These new modes give rise to the need for new norms and work practices. Traditional work practices built on older technologies like the use of office phones for personal business, use of photocopy machines, and methods to distribute information may not adapt well to new technologies. What are the expectations of the rapidity of answering e-mail? What web site use is appropriate at work? Is posting a form on a web site sufficient access for students and staff? Who has access to restricted data bases? Is tele-commuting a privilege of those in powerful management positions or can the system also accommodate other service workers who could work off site (e.g., the room assignment clerk)?

The generational affect of technology leaves many campuses with older faculty and staff who refuse to learn or adapt to new electronic processes. Likewise, technologically-adept faculty and staff quickly find their computers, software, and other systems out-moded and insufficient for their work.

New specialist roles have emerged. The newest job title on the scene appears to be chief information officer. All employees need technology support staff to assist with computer problems from viruses to network development. Some campuses are creating student technology peer supports (similar to resident assistants) provided for student technological assistance in residence.

In a meta-frame, the possibilities of technology require all campus educators to examine which of their core functions and processes can best be handled by technology and which are essential for human interaction (Engstrom & Kruger, 1997). Distance learning is clearly an option and demands that campus-based educators understand the value-added component of in-person human interaction in the learning process.

Faculty Roles Are Receiving the Most Examination

Faculty work and the faculty role have become a focus of attention in recent years. The institution of tenure has been challenged raising questions of preserving academic freedom while concurrently creating more flexible work force policies. From *ProfScam* (1988) to *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), attention to faculty work load has revealed a range of complexities from refocusing on teaching to the nature of research and role of service in professional life. Professional associations have established various initiatives to address changing faculty work (e.g., AAHE's project on Faculty Roles and Rewards).

A positive and core force in this reconceptualization has been an emphasis on the powerful and essential role of faculty in student learning, student retention, an a growing concern for the student experience (Kellogg Commission, 1997a). External groups (e.g., legislatures, trustees, parents) have posed critical questions about who is teaching undergraduates, the value of some research, and the perception of faculty as resistors of change instead of agents of change (Wingspread Group, 1993).

Budget reductions are likely having a profound effect on faculty work. Land grant colleges report that the top actions they would consider in the face of budget reductions would be to increase instructional workload (41%), make more use of nontraditional instructional delivery systems (39%) and increase class size (37%) (Kellogg Commission, 1997b). All of these have a profound impact on faculty work.

Collaborative Practices Are Increasingly Essential in the Campus Work Environment

Campuses are emphasizing the need for collaborative practice, including cross-functional work teams. Early 1990s practices of re-engineering, Total Quality Management (TQM) and related forms of continuous quality improvement brought an awareness of new ways for working together to share problems, share resources, and in general become shareholders in the institutional future. While some are skeptical of business models applied to higher education, such TQM concepts of viewing other campus offices as our own

internal customers seems to have contributed to a changing culture of internal responsiveness. Some of the most promising initiatives appear to be around the shared agenda of retention, the first year student experience, assessment, and service learning.

Academic practices are encouraging collaboration. Faculty are being encouraged by Deans of Undergraduate Studies and Honors Programs to develop cluster courses, living-learning centers, cross disciplinary courses, and capstone experiences . These new curricular developments involve other faculty, other disciplines, and require cooperation toward new strategies (Gabelnick, MacGregor, Matthews, & Smith, 1990; Shapiro & Levine, 1999).

Collaboration is widely regarded as essential to effective practice in these rapidly changing times (Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Kohn, 1986). Many campuses espouse collaboration but have not modified processes to facilitate collaborative action (e.g. continuing to allocate budgets using an "each tub on its own bottom" approach, rewarding individual merit but not team or group effort). Until rewards and budgets support collaborative structures and practices, it will be difficult to truly transform work to become more truly collaborative.

An Emphasis On Student Learning Is Broadening the View of Who Are Campus Educators

The American Council on Education (El-Khawas & Knopp, 1996) reported that for half of all colleges, "increased attention to teaching and learning ranked among their most significant program changes in the last decade." (p. 2). Recognizing that student learning and development occurs in the entire environment (both inside and outside the classroom) reconceptualizes who are campus educators. This realization leads to student affairs-faculty coalitions for such learning endeavors as service learning, developmental education, and leadership. A new emphasis on experiential learning, service, retention, assessing campus outcomes, campus climate, and learning communities has enriched the role and appreciation for student affairs professionals. The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (1997a) asserted a commitment to "address the academic and personal development of students in a comprehensive fashion by encouraging greater integration of academic and student services" (p. 22).

Further, the awareness of student learning leads to new expectations of campus support staff who supervise student employees and have responsibility for the education of students in the campus workplace. Student employees, whether undergraduate or graduate students, have started to receive institutional attention.

Financial Pressures Lead to Changing the Nature of Work

Educational observers agree that higher education cannot continue the practice of passing along rising costs to the student consumer, but must redistribute limited funds to internal priorities. One strategy has been to downsize the work force. Budgetary reductions have forced the examination of what work needs to be done by college employees and what work can be contracted out.

The decision of whether to privatize or outsource some services is a difficult one (Schuh, 1996). The process of identifying such services to outsource goes to the core of what educational services must remain in-house to assure continuity, quality, and communication and which can be handled otherwise (CHEMA/NACUBO, 1993). When campuses outsource services such as bookstores, food service, and graduate apartments, campus administrators often find that they need new competencies as writers of Requests for Proposals (RFPs) and managers of contracts. Advocates of outsourcing point to enriched services, cost savings, and stimulus in the local economy as advantages to these methods. If handled well, privatization can continue worker loyalty and quality of work life. If handled poorly, it can generate fear and disloyalty in remaining employees who observe the privatization process mistreating those with longevity, cutting benefits, or lowering the quality of service. In the absence of humane human resource policy statements, privatization can threatened the core values of loyalty and care so embedded in a people-intense setting.

A new work environment is being created for professional staff who might be increasingly hired in contract agencies rather than be employees of the host educational institution (e.g., health care, food service, housing, custodial services, computer services). Professionals in those areas, however, often feel unwel-

comed at professional meetings and may not be included in campus staff meetings. The long standing success of many contract food services or book store operations could serve as a model for how other agencies might stay integral to their campuses if these courses of action are chosen.

Financial pressures have also raised accountability questions of worker productivity. How many courses should faculty teach? What number of publications serve as an indicator of success for academic promotion and tenure? What enrollment levels are essential to continue curricular programs; what is the cost productivity of select student life programs; how many clients should a psychologist see in the counseling center? In addition, campus functions (including some academic programs) increasingly are being asked by their campus leadership to document their direct and indirect impact on campus outcomes as a feature of their continuation.

Employee Diversity in All Forms Enriches the Work and Learning Environment

Higher education institutions have made a strong commitment to affirmative action practices, have continually broadened non-discrimination statements, and have recognized that diverse students need to see themselves reflected in the diversity of the employees in the college work environment. Paradoxically, the most recent legal threats to affirmative action have been contexualized in higher education (e.g., California and Texas) but have generated ground swells of affirmation for commitment to diversity as essential for public policy and quality education (See Association of American Universities, 1997). Key associations have developed extensive resources and supports for campus diversity including diversity in employment (e.g., Association of American Colleges and University's "Establishing Diversity as an Educational and Civic Priority" project, the American Council on Education's Office for Minority Affairs).

While educators have observed that diverse role models influence student efficacy, student satisfaction, and make the campus a less chilly environment (Smith & Associates, 1997), there is sadly less empirical evidence of the impact of diversity on the learning environment. Recent work in this area is promising (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1998) and will be increasingly essential to defend or shape campus admissions, hiring, and other employment practices.

The Nature of Valuing Employees Is Taking New Forms

Colleges have long asserted that employees—the people—are the most important campus resource. This affirmation is perceived in reality by the broader college work force as a disproportionate attention on faculty with less attention to the concerns of professional staff or classified staff. Graduate assistants have become a louder voice in demanding an examination of the nature of their work and benefits to the institution with a continued movement toward teaching assistant unions to protect their working conditions and examine job requirements.

There are new trends in the nature of benefits and staff services following the broader national family-friendly work environment movement (e.g., child care, elder care, cafeteria-benefits packages, domestic partner benefits). In addition many campuses are expanding where work is done and how it is done to include options for flex-time (to also better serve evening and weekend campus needs) and flex-place (made possible through telecommuting).

Implications of Trends for Practice

Traditional practices on many campus have marginalized the role of student affairs work, yet with today's agenda including retention, campus civility, assessing learning and developmental outcomes, and creating learning communities, student affairs educators have an opportunity to be key partners in their institution's agenda. Some of the trends previously identified could be viewed with gloom and dread, or can be framed as a movement toward a committed, diverse, adaptable work force valuing collaborative practices in a time of financial stress with a reaffirmation of the centrality of student learning and development leading to an examination of faculty roles and a broader view of diverse campus educators. Indeed, 28% of all ACE's responding institutions (and 39% of the private colleges) report "better student services" as one of the four most highly ranked significant institutional changes engaged in over the last ten years (El-Khawas & Knopp, 1996, p. 6).

Space precludes a detailed explication of implications, but several are of note. Particular implications for student affairs practice and the student experience should be explored. Some implications to explore include:

- strategies for recruiting and retaining a diverse work force at all levels and in all units of the institution.
- the renewal and developmental needs of the long term core group of employees to stay adaptable, to be engaged in campus life, and to expand their capacity to address complexity.
- technological applications that assist staff and faculty to spend more time on developmental interaction with students (e.g., advising and mentoring) and less on information giving (e.g., course scheduling). This includes convergence between which processes students would find best delivered electronically and which they prefer to be done in person.
- revisions in the reward systems (1) to emphasize the faculty role in the student experience (e.g., valuing teaching, advising, mentoring, and working with students outside the classroom) and (2) to value teams and groups to balance the current over reliance only on individual merit.
- practices that value multidisciplinary perspectives in all forms including multi-level and cross-functional involvement in shared problems which would bring student affairs professionals and students into campus decision making processes.
- training and development interventions for new adaptive forms of work to assist employees in learning about collaborative practices and strategies for developing common purposes.
- experiential learning in all forms with a particular emphasis on how the design of such experiences can use the talents of student affairs educators and counselors along with discipline based faculty.
- expectations of undergraduate student employment, and effective mechanisms for it to be a developmental experience with an expectation of intentional student learning
- the socialization of graduate students into the professoriate. Building on initiatives from the Council of Graduate Schools, Teaching assistants (TAs) need more focused orientation to student learning, the teaching-learning process, and creating learning climates. TAs are an underdeveloped opportunity for creating new generations of student-centered faculty.
- core work functions and administrative processes through technological applications so that technology serves the primary functions of higher education but does not define them.

There is great promise in these work environment trends to create a new level of engagement with employees in the central functions of higher education in collaborative and adaptive ways (Heifitz, 1994). Those institutions that adapt to their decline in resources only in incremental ways and view change as a threat will need to shift to see how work could be organized differently. They will need to make the difficult decisions of who does this work, how this work is to be done, and where this work can occur. Student affairs staff need to retain the impact on students as its central focus as these trends evolve to influence policy and practice.

Implication of Trends for Research

Changes in the work environment of higher education are ripe with research potential. Multiple modes of inquiry are essential to understand the impacts of these work environment changes and researchers should be encouraged to use and triangulate multiple methods.

Technology allows for new forms of quick research using web sites, on line course registration, and other electronic processes. Before registering on line students can be asked to complete a short attitudinal survey about a topic of campus interest or faculty and staff get receive an electronic mail survey. Focus group methods with target groups of employees (e.g., part time faculty, outsourced health center staff, staff with English as a second language) would provide rich information to shape campus practices.

Areas of research include such topics as:

- employee and employer satisfaction, engagement, and productivity with flex time and flex place work;
- effective ways to assess faculty and student affairs staff role and impact in various student outcomes like retention, learning, and satisfaction;

- studies of effective practices and effective processes in staff development;
- the impact of work place diversity on such student outcomes as student learning and satisfaction;
- the impact on student learning and development of staff and faculty technological applications (e.g., class listservs, web based involvement opportunities).
- and views of the campus work environment after participating in collaborative efforts.

Any and all changes in the who, what, where, when, and how of campus work should be thoughtfully evaluated and its impact on student outcomes assessed. All these processes should pose research questions to study the differential impact of any change by sex, race/ethnicity, and age of participants. The variations in the human experience and in the campus context require that we continue to explore the possible differential effects of any change on different populations in different work environments.

References

Association of American Universities (April 24, 1997). On the importance of diversity in university admissions. *The New York Times*, p. A27.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

CHEMA/NACUBO (1993). *Contract Management or self operation: A decision making quide for higher education.* Washington, DC: Council of Higher Education Management Associations and the National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Chrislip, D. D. , & Larson, C. E. (1994). *Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

El-Khawas, E., & Knopp, L. (1996). *Campus trends 1996.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Engstrom, C. E., & Kruger, K. W. (1997). *Using technology to promote student learning: Opportunities for today and tomorrow.* New Directions for Student Services Series 78. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gabelnick, F., MacGregor, J., Matthews, R. S., & Smith, B. L. (1990). *Learning communities: Creating connections among students, faculty, and disciplines.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning #41. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pederson, A.R., & Allen, W.A. (1998). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ ethnic diversity in higher education.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Series #8. Washington, DC: George Washington University Press.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (1997a). *Returning to our roots: The student experience.* Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (1997b). *The student experience: Data related to change.* Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Kohn, A. (1986). *No contest: The case against competition.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Schuh, J.H. (1996). Planning and finance. In S. R. Komives, & D. B. Woodard, Jr. (Eds). *Student services: Handbook for the profession (2nd ed).* (pp. 458-475). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shapiro, N.S., & Levine, J. H. (1999, forthcoming). *Creating learning communities.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, D. G., with Gerbick, G. L., Figueroa, M.A., Watkins, G. H., Levitan, T., Moore, L.C., Merchant, P.A., Beliak, H.F., and Figueroa, B. (1997). *Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities.

Sykes, C. J. (1988). *ProfScam: Professors and the demise of higher education.* New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education (1993). *An American imperative: Higher expectations for higher education.* Racine, WI: Johnson Foundation.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ON

The Changing Nature of Work in Higher Education

Susan R. Komives, Associate Professor
Counseling and Personnel Services
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

One of the outcomes of rapid change has been the need to examine and redesign the nature of work in higher education. This reconceptualization has been driven by technology, financial hardship, sharpened mission statements, new forms of accountability, changing student characteristics, and a recentering on student learning. Higher education seems faced with a dynamic tension caused by the restraining forces of decades of tradition being confronted by the driving forces of rapid change. Current trends of change seem to be probing the very core of who does what work in higher education, what that work is and how it is rewarded, how and when that work is accomplished, and where it happens.

These work force changes raise numerous research questions including the following:

1. What is the impact of diversity in the work place on various college outcomes (e.g., employee satisfaction, quality of campus decision making, student satisfaction, student persistence)?
2. What practices move a campus toward being a multicultural work environment?
3. Is there a different knowledge base of campus resources among adjunct/contract employees and full time employees? Do students differ in evaluations (e.g., learning, satisfaction, contact) among adjunct/contract employees and full time employees?
4. What are the direct and indirect contributions of faculty and student affairs educators to specific student out comes such as student persistence, learning, commitment to citizenship, and satisfaction?
5. How does the utilization of flex time or flex place practices influence employee satisfaction and persistence? How does the utilization of flex time or flex place practice influence student satisfaction?
6. What services do students prefer be delivered technologically and which services do students prefer be delivered interpersonally?
7. What is the impact on student learning of various technological applications (e.g., class listservs, web based involvement opportunities)? What is student satisfaction with various technological pedagogies?
8. What amount of learning do student employees attribute to their campus employment positions?
9. What staff and faculty training interventions best relate to promoting collaboration across work units? What are the barriers and incentives to campus collaboration?
10. What campus practices matter most to employee satisfaction (e.g., benefits, development, involvement)?

Any and all changes in the who, what, where, when, and how of campus work should be thoughtfully evaluated and its impact on student outcomes assessed. All these processes should pose research questions to study the differential impact of any change by sex, race/ethnicity, and age of participants. The variations in the human experience and in the campus context require that we continue to explore the possible differential effects of any change on different populations in different work environments.

Collaboration and Partnerships

Charles C. Schroeder, Professor
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

A revolution is underway and student affairs must be willing to join the cause or be swept aside in the inevitable transformation that will occur. Nowhere is this revolution more apparent than in recent reports (Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, 1997; Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993) on the status of higher education that call for major reform of undergraduate education by connecting undergraduate experiences with student learning. The reports highlight major trends that are dramatically effecting the quality of undergraduate education, trends such as: the rapid rise in college costs; reduced faculty teaching loads; an emphasis on research over teaching; shifting economic agendas at the state and national levels; greater emphasis on access, affordability and accountability; accusations of inefficiency, duplication and waste; the emerging role of technology in transforming the campus; industry critique regarding the poor preparation of graduates; increasingly diverse student populations; deteriorating public trust in the higher education enterprise and, lack of service and institutional assistance to local communities and states. Colleges and universities are responding to these challenges by rethinking the large lecture halls, discreet academic departments, faculty tenure and other features that have defined traditional institutions for centuries. Schools are designing curriculums more relevant to employers, communities and students, and experimenting with innovative pedagogies that help bridge the gap between ideal academic standards and actual student performance.

The challenges and trends highlighted by recent higher education reports are emerging from two very different cultural perspectives — the managerial culture of governing boards, corporations and governmental agencies and the collegial culture of colleges and universities. These cultures are increasingly in conflict and the conflict simply reflects the opposite and at times, antagonistic, values and principles prized by members of each group. The managerial culture values productivity, efficiency, accountability, hierarchical organizational structures, technical leadership, a customer-orientation and "bottom-line" results. These qualities are in stark contrast to those valued by the collegial culture which emphasizes autonomy, shared governance, qualitative (as opposed to quantitative) judgments, faculty prerogatives, peer leadership and merit. The constant struggle between these competing perspectives is limiting undergraduate education reform and threatening the future of student affairs. According to Rice (1998) what is needed is a vision of a new culture — a collaborative culture — that incorporates the most admirable qualities of the other two. The following qualities are associated with a collaborative culture: learning-centered; interdependent; bicultural; generative communication; pro-active; and systemically-oriented. Because student affairs organizations straddle the managerial and collegial cultures, they share many of the values prized by each; therefore, student affairs is in a favored position to provide leadership for the creation of a collaborative culture through developing partnerships with a variety of internal and external constituents to promote student learning and educational attainment.

Collaborative partnerships within and across organizational settings are flourishing as educational and service institutions cope with increased complexity and massive change. Because higher education and student

affairs are faced with similar challenges, the importance of forging collaborative partnerships to enhance student learning is a central tenet of the *Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA , 1994) — "Student affairs professionals attempt to make seamless what are often perceived by students to be disjointed, unconnected experiences by bridging organizational boundaries and forging collaborative partnerships with faculty and others to enhance student learning." Similarly, the new document, *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (ACPA and NASPA 1997), emphasizes that, "Good practice in student affairs forges educational partnerships that advance student learning."

Although collaboration is quite easy to extol, it is difficult to achieve. Staff in student affairs, for example, have historically kept their efforts focused almost exclusively *within* their organizational boundaries, rather than reaching out and assuming a broader, institutional perspective necessary for collaboration with internal constituents (i.e., faculty, academic administrators, etc.) as well as such external constituents as educational sectors (i.e., K-12 institutions, "feeder" high schools), community constituents (local businesses, not-for-profit organizations, social service agencies) and governmental organizations (municipal government; federal and state agencies; local legislative delegations). To develop effective collaborative partnerships with these constituents that address the previous list of challenges, certain obstacles and constraints must be acknowledged and overcome.

Obstacles and Constraints to Developing Collaborative Partnerships

During the past 30 years, college and university enrollments have more than quadrupled. As institutions have become more complex, we have attempted to address complexities through specialization and, in the process, our organizations have become increasingly fragmented. Today many campuses — especially large public universities — are characterized by a constellation of independent principalities and fiefdoms, each disconnected from the others and from any common institutional purpose or transcending value. It is not uncommon for student affairs' divisions, colleges and schools to be quite autonomous, with different foci, priorities and expectations for staff, faculty and students. Our highly specialized, hierarchical organizations have lead to increased compartmentalization, often resulting in what has popularly been described as "functional silos" or "mine shafts." These vertical structures, while often effective at promoting interaction *within* units, create obstacles to interaction, coordination and collaboration *between* units. Nowhere is this problem more apparent than with regard to the historical gap that separates academic affairs and student affairs. What prevents collaboration between the two groups on campus most directly involved with students? An abundant literature (Blake, 1979 and 1996; Kuh, 1997; Love, et al. 1993; and Whitt, 1996) suggests that a variety of factors can prohibit collaboration, including: fundamental cultural differences between faculty and student affairs educators in terms of personality styles, educational preparation, values, and purposes; the historical separation of the formal curriculum from the informal co-curriculum; a prevailing view that the role of student affairs is ancillary, supplementary or complementary to the academic mission of the institution; competing assumptions about what constitutes effective undergraduate learning; and, different institutional expectations and rewards for academic faculty and student affairs educators. As Young (1996) indicates, these are not new concerns, but rather deeply imbedded issues that carry long histories within student affairs and higher education. Over 50 years ago, for example, the "A Student Personnel Point of View" enumerated many of these challenges and emphasized the need for collaboration between student personnel workers, faculty, and students to reform the campus community (Roberts, 1998). If obstacles such as these constrain collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs, then it is not surprising that collaborative initiatives that connect student affairs and various external constituents are equally challenging and, hence, rarely pursued.

Opportunities for Collaboration

In developing collaborative partnerships between student affairs and various internal and external constituents, it is important to distinguish between means and ends. Partnerships are means to greater ends — such ends as higher levels of student learning and educational attainment. Because learning is a cumulative process, which includes multiple dimensions and outcomes, effective learning approaches: emphasize appli-

cation and experience; link established concepts to new situations; emphasize interpersonal collaboration; and, incorporate rich and frequent feedback on performance. By establishing collaborative partnerships with internal and external constituents, student affairs' educators can utilize effective learning approaches to create *performance support systems* that link, align and integrate a variety of resources, both on and off-campus, to promote the attainment of various learning outcomes. Here are a few examples worth considering.

Collaborative Partnerships with Constituents Internal to the Institution

Recent institutional efforts to reinvigorate undergraduate education at various colleges and universities have focused on addressing such institutional objectives as: improving academic achievement, retention and educational attainment; fostering civic engagement through service learning; designing learning communities; creating undergraduate research opportunities; broadening community outreach efforts; and, developing diverse, inclusive communities that value understanding, acceptance and respect for human differences. The following institutions created performance support systems to address many of these objectives through collaborative partnerships. Auburn University created a new Student Success Center that integrates a variety of campus activities, functional units and resources in academic affairs and student affairs to promote academic and social success throughout the undergraduate experience. Through a collaborative partnership between student affairs and the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Missouri-Columbia, over 60 Freshmen Interest Groups (FIGs) Learning Communities were established that purposefully integrate curricular and co-curricular experiences by co-enrolling students in three common courses and co-assigning them to the same floor of a residence hall. At Georgetown University, the Volunteer and Public Service Center was created as a result of a unique educational partnership between student affairs educators and faculty to foster student civic engagement through a range of service learning initiatives in the greater Washington, D.C. area. These programs (some of which shared costs and enriched their programs through pooled funds) are examples of collaborative initiatives that respond to specific institutional problems and concerns — issues that could be resolved only by cross-functional dialogues and cooperation. In considering the development of partnerships such as these, reflect upon the following questions and challenges.

Questions and Challenges: What processes and mechanisms should student affairs educators use to identify undergraduate education opportunities that lend themselves to such cross-functional, collaborative responses? How can student affairs educators enhance student success by forging alliances with colleagues in faculty development programs, academic advising, the learning center and academic enrichment programs — functional units that "straddle" academic affairs and student affairs? How can existing academic structures — such as English writing courses — be utilized to help students reflect, through the writing process, on important student life issues such as diversity, binge-drinking, civility, gender issues, etc.? How can student affairs educators form partnerships with faculty and academic administrators to create residential colleges that link courses and co-curricular experiences around general education themes? How can student affairs educators help students and faculty to intentionally connect academic work and out-of-class experiences?

Partnerships with Other Educational Sectors External to the Institution

To create performance support systems and seamless learning environments, colleges and universities must identify, link and align resources in educational sectors external to their institutions. Developing collaborative partnerships through such alignments not only enhances undergraduate education, but also highlights the crucial role of higher education in improving public schools. Examples of some nationally acclaimed partnerships include: the Northern Arizona University/Arizona Western College partnership that is a cost-effective delivery system that integrates programs, resources and educational experiences in one location for a community college and four-year institution; "K-16 Councils" and "community compacts" recently established in major cities across the country to link and align K-12 institutions with local colleges and universities; the Phoenix Urban Systematic Initiative, whose goal is "systematic change" in the Phoenix Public Schools through developing partnerships between

the three levels of educational institutions in the metropolitan area; and, "College Leadership New Jersey," a collaborative, statewide, inter-institutional leadership and service program that involves a diverse group of college juniors from 22 public and private institutions throughout the state.

The creation of educational consortiums is another form of collaborative partnerships that offer multiple benefits including shared health and insurance plans and joint management of study abroad programs and sites. In addition, several campuses (e.g., University of Baltimore and Maryland Institute and College of Art) also share use of campus health clinics, recreational facilities, auditoriums, etc.

Because local elementary and secondary schools can provide rich educational settings for enhancing undergraduate education, collaborative partnerships can be developed with them in order to provide service learning opportunities, internships, practicums, undergraduate research programs and community service experiences. The recent federal initiative, "America Reads Challenge Program" has resulted in a number of university-public school partnerships to provide literacy programs in elementary schools. College students can earn their college work study funds (CSW) by providing literacy education to youngsters in their own community. Student affairs' educators can also provide leadership for various institutional enrollment management initiatives by developing collaborative partnerships with key educational leaders in their primary high school "feeder" institutions. For example, to address poor math performance on the part of college freshmen, student affairs' educators, working collaboratively with their math faculty colleagues can convene a "math performance summit" that brings together college faculty and high school math teachers to explore reasons for poor performance in basic math courses. In addition, pipeline programs for recruiting and retaining minority students can be developed through collaboration between student affairs educators and high school principals. A variety of early identification and pre-college enhancement programs can result in increased enrollment of these students at the institution. In considering partnerships such as these, reflect upon the following questions and challenges.

Questions and Challenges: What undergraduate education objectives could best be fulfilled through partnerships with leaders in other educational sectors? How can relationships be established with stakeholders in these sectors that might result in collaborative initiatives? What kinds of resources — human, fiscal, and, in some cases physical — must be linked and aligned to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives? What new roles are necessary for student affairs educators to create performance support systems that link and align people, resources and experiences to produce mutually valued learning outcomes?

Partnerships with Business Groups, Corporations, Social Service Agencies and Municipal, State and Federal Governments

One of the most challenging trends confronting higher education is the lack of service and institutional assistance to local communities and states. Now, more than ever, it is important for higher education to consider how best to use the resources it has to meet the needs of communities while simultaneously improving student learning and development. Examples of successful collaborations in this area include Duquesne University and DePaul University who formed partnerships with HUD's Office of University Partnerships that enable all aspects of their universities to work in tandem with their municipalities, public housing developments, community-based organizations and business communities to revitalize the economy and educate and train local residents. At other institutions, partnerships between student affairs and social science faculty (i.e., psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists) have utilized a variety of assessment initiatives to determine community needs and then used the data to design service learning initiatives for addressing them. Encouraging community-institution partnerships for fraternities, sororities, clubs, organizations and academic student councils with agencies such as the Red Cross, Big Brothers-Big Sisters, the United Way and others connect undergraduate students with "real life" community issues and problems and, in the process, helps facilitate their civic leadership development.

Student affairs' educators at the University of Colorado — Boulder have formed partnerships with members of their local legislative delegation to foster undergraduates' civic engagement and civic leadership by including legislators as members of residential

college design teams. This involvement provides legislators with opportunities to shape the civic leadership agenda, as well as the curricular and co-curricular activities that support it.

Collaborative partnerships between student affairs educators and local business leaders, municipal government officials, and state agencies (i.e., Liquor Control Board, Public Health) have produced "university-community summits" to address major problems associated with binge drinking by college students. By emphasizing the importance of this problem to the *entire* community, a sense of collective responsibility emerges for addressing it.

Student affairs' educators can also assist in facilitating partnerships between business groups and corporations. At Penn State University, the University of Maryland and the University of Missouri-Columbia, exclusive beverage contracts were negotiated with major corporations. As a result, millions of dollars flow to these institutions and these funds are being used for minority scholarships, the construction of a new Student Success Center and the creation of international internships for students of color. Similar partnerships have resulted in a variety of in-kind contributions from business and industry. For example, Alverno College recruits and trains over 300 business leaders in the greater Milwaukee area to serve as "learning assessors," providing students with frequent feedback on their performance with regard to the eight abilities that comprise the Alverno curriculum. Building partnerships such as these requires reflecting upon the following issues.

Questions and Challenges: What can/should student affairs educators, faculty, students and institutions do to help create healthier communities? How can meaningful partnerships be established and maintained between colleges and universities and their surrounding communities? What leadership roles must student affairs adopt to connect undergraduate education objectives with the agendas of business groups, corporations, social service agencies and municipal, state and federal governments?

Strategies for Establishing Collaborative Partnerships

The success of the projects listed in this paper reflects many of the following strategies. First, most of the collaborative partnerships resulted from a "triggering" opportunity which represented a particular felt need within the college or university. Second, many partnerships resulted from fundamental shifts of perspectives — viewing problems and opportunities through "new lenses." Third, opportunities were created for key stakeholders to develop shared visions of what mattered — of what was important and worth addressing through collaboration. Fourth, resources (human, fiscal, physical, etc.) were linked and aligned to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives (i.e., improved retention, enhanced academic achievement, etc.). Fifth, collaborative partnerships involved the development of cross-functional teams committed to common purposes and educational outcomes. Sixth, senior leaders were strong champions and advocates for innovation and change and they made visible commitments to the various initiatives. Seventh, collaborative partnerships such as these required thinking and acting systemically. Finally, everyone was willing to take some risks and cross the traditional boundaries separating their organizational functions to address common objectives.

Conclusion

Higher education is in the midst of a dramatic and profound change. Reform of undergraduate education is a priority for most colleges and universities. Increasing success rates, improving student learning productivity, developing civic leadership, enhancing multi-cultural understanding and achieving higher levels of educational attainment necessitate greater integration between curricular and co-curricular experiences. Addressing these imperatives requires the development of collaborative partnerships between student affairs and various internal and external constituencies. As suggested by the recent Kellogg Commission (1997) report entitled "Returning to Our Roots: The Student Experience," new forms of educational and administrative leadership are needed because, "Our challenges are no longer technical issues of how to allocate rising revenues, but difficult adaptive problems of how to lead when conditions are constantly changing, resources are tight, expectations are high, and options are limited. We live in an age of transformational, not technical, change. Our leadership, like our institutions, must become transformational as well

(p.v)." We can view these challenges as overwhelming threats, or as opportunities to transform undergraduate education by developing collaborative partnerships with important internal and external constituents. Such an effort is surely worthy of our time and attention.

References

American College Personnel Association (1994). "The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs." Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association.

American College Personnel Association and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (1997). "Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs." Washington, D.C.: ACPA and NASPA.

Blake, E.S. (1979). "Classroom and Context: An Educational Dialectic." *Academe*, 65, 280-292.

Blake, E. S. (1996). "The Yin and Yang of Student Learning in College." *About Campus*, 1 (4), 4–9.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (1997). "Returning to Our Roots: The Student Experience."

Kuh, G. D. (1997). "Working Together to Enhance Student Learning Inside and Outside the Classroom." Paper presented at the Annual AAHE Assessment and Quality Conference, Miami, FL.

Love, P. G., Jacobs, G.A., Poschini, V. J., Hardy, C. M., and Kuh, G. D. (1993). "Student Culture." In G. D. Kuh, *Cultural Perspectives in Student Affairs Work*. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association.

Rice, R. E. (1998, January). "The Future of Faculty Work and the Learning Community." Paper presented at the "Transforming Campuses into Learning Communities" Conference, Miami, FL., January.

Roberts, D. C. (1998). "Student Learning Was Always Supposed to be the Core of Our Work — What Happened?" *About Campus*, 3 (3), 18-22.

Whitt, E. J. (1996). "Some Propositions Worth Debating." *About Campus*, 1 (4), 31-32.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education (1993). *An American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education*. Racine, WI.: Johnson Foundation.

Young, R. B. (1996). "Guiding Values and Philosophy." In S. R. Komives and D. B. Woodard (Eds.) *Student Services A Handbook for the Profession*. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass, 83-105.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ON

Collaboration and Partnerships

Charles C. Schroeder, Professor
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

Collaboration and Partnerships Research Questions

1. What are the historical, conceptual and theoretical foundations for collaboration between and among individuals, disciplines and organizations?

2. What are the elements or characteristics that are basic to the concept of collaboration (i.e., critical attributes of collaboration that define the concept)?

3. What are the elements of the successful collaborative practice or partnership?

4. What conditions are necessary or conducive to a successful collaborative partnership?

5. What decision-making practices and models best encourage effective collaborative partnerships?

6. What administrative functions are best suited for effective partnerships?

7. What personal or professional attributes of individuals contribute to success within a collaborative partnership?

8. Do gender, ethnic and racial dynamics differentially effect the development of collaborative partnerships?

9. How does prior experience as an educator influence one's approach to developing partnerships?

10. What commitments must "would be" collaborators make to collaboration?

11. What are the potential benefits of collaboration among team members?

12. How are successful collaborative partnerships designed, implemented and sustained?

13. What skills and competencies are needed for educators to shift from autonomous functioning to collaborative functioning?

14. What is the relationship between the process of collaboration among various practitioners and the desired outcomes of the partnership?

15. To what extent are "would-be" collaborators clear on the goals and outcomes for their particular collaborative partnership?

16. What are the barriers to collaboration?

17. How do concepts of power, autonomy and independence influence collaboration?

18. Are there any shortcuts to establishing a full-blown collaborative partnership?

19. What assessment practices and models can be utilized to demonstrate the efficacy of collaboration?

20. What are the social, political, economic and moral implications of collaboration?

Accountability for Student Affairs:

TRENDS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Gregory S. Blimling, Vice Chancellor
Student Development Office
Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina

We have to strip higher education down to the basics—students, teachers, and blackboards. Cut out all of these counseling programs, opportunities for acting, student periodicals and guest lecturers. These things are in themselves valuable, but if we can't afford them, they are the things that should go, together with the personnel that operate them. [italics added] (Honan, 1998, p. 44)

These were not the words of a poorly educated, anti-intellectual bureaucrat or politician hoping to capitalize on a popular criticism of higher education. These were the comments of Jacques Barzun, the well-known Columbia University professor of philosophy and history, in response to questions of institutional accountability for the increasing costs of higher education (Honan, 1998, p. 44). His sentiments are becoming increasingly common among those in the public who demand accountability for the rising cost of education, increasing problems of student behavior, and low graduation rates.

Although student affairs organizations are not at the center of controversy over accountability in higher education, criticism of the profession is growing. The complaints leveled against student affairs are part of a much larger agenda of reform that has been rattling higher education for the past decade. Levine (1996) believed that this reform movement began in the mid-1980s following the publication of the federal report *A Nation at Risk*. This report was followed by more than two dozen national publications critical of education (Gamson, 1987).

Reform of higher education was the natural consequence of erosion of public trust in important social institutions such as the church, the government, and the military during the 1970s. Criticism of K-12 education was the harshest. Home schooling, charter schools, tuition vouchers, and required national teacher exams emerged from public mistrust of education and from concern over student behavior and poor academic performance.

During this same period, state budget constraints and a bevy of media stories about sexual harassment by professors, faculty research on medieval Italian marble formations, professors' six-hour teaching loads, and students' complaints about instructors who could not speak English filled the pages of the daily newspapers and the nightly news. Legislators began asking awkward questions about graduation rates, faculty teaching, availability of classes, and language skills of teaching assistants from other countries; the answers they received caused them concern. Subsequently, support for higher education by legislators and other community leaders eroded. Encouraged by the media, the public accepted the opinion that higher education was

mismanaged, wasted resources, and lacked accountability (Brenamen, 1993; Harvey, 1996; Mahtesian, 1995; Wadsworth, 1995).

In spite of the criticisms, the public remains confident in higher education's ability to provide the skills and credentials necessary for a high quality of life. However, both community leaders and the general public have agreed on wanting an accountability system that produces qualified graduates, useful research, and affordable access to education (Harvey, 1996; Wadsworth, 1995).

Questions raised about accountability in higher education are many, but three concerns are directed more at student affairs: student behavior, cost efficiency in student services, and effectiveness of student affairs programs.

Accountability for Student Behavior

Newspaper accounts of hate speech issues, police drug raids at college fraternities, problems with overnight guests in residence halls, hazing, academic dishonesty, gang rape, binge-drinking deaths, acquaintance rape, riots by drunken hordes of college students, and campus violence are student life issues that fall on the doorstep of student affairs. The result of the increased attention to these issues has strengthened the position of those in the media who contend that universities shelter students from accountability through a system of disciplinary counseling designed to protect institutions from public scrutiny (Bernstein, 1996; Sheehan, 1996). Although people within the academic community deny this relationship with their students, many outside the academic community hear and believe these criticisms.

The Campus Security Act was enacted to hold institutions more accountable, primarily for student behavior. In recent years, media proponents have argued that opening disciplinary hearings to the public will make institutions more accountable for the disciplinary decisions they make about students' behavior (Berstein, 1996). Court challenges by members of the student press and by conservative national press groups have forced institutions in Georgia and Ohio to release disciplinary information even though these records remain confidential under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Legislation has recently been enacted by Congress that permits the disclosure of the names and the results of disciplinary hearings of students who have been found guilty in a student conduct hearing of any crime of violence (as that term is defined in Section 16 of Title 18, United States Code) and permits university administrators to disclose to parents of students under the age of 21 any violation of law or institutional policy governing the possession of alcohol or controlled substances, regardless of whether or not that information is contained in a student's educational record.

Some of higher education's critics believe student behavior problems are caused when institutions abandon the moral and ethical development of students and substitute an agenda of political correctness, feminist dogma, and a value-free ideology. Sowell (1995), an economist and senior research fellow at the conservative Hoover Institute, explained this position:

> "Freshman orientation is treated as an opportunity to have spokesmen for homosexuals, radical feminists, environmentalists, and other causes get a shot at a captive audience. Conservative views to the contrary are not only screened out but shouted down, whether originating on campus or in lectures by outside speakers.... The question is not why alumni are trying to restore some integrity to colleges. The question is why it took them so long to act." (p. 130)

Using college residence halls and information from various campus disciplinary codes as examples, Hoekema (1994) also criticized student affairs for abandoning its commitment to establishing clear values and categories for desirable and undesirable behavior; he cited the profession's failure to take a position for addressing each of these issues. Hoekema blamed student affairs practitioners who, in his view, have created residence halls which gravitate to the lowest common denominator of behavior. He described the halls as environments where students have the right to do what they want, where a general lack of any privacy prevails, and where institutions have been ineffective in dealing with alcohol and drugs.

Implications of this increasing pressure for institutions to be more accountable for student behavior include the following:

- State and federal laws regulating student behavior on campus will increase, particularly laws concerning alcohol consumption.

- The media will intensify intrusion into the personal lives of students and greater media attention will be given to individual student behavior.
- Student records will become less confidential, particularly records concerning disciplinary actions.
- Litigation from students concerning their right to privacy will increase.
- The role and scope of student conduct hearings in matters of criminal misconduct will be clarified by legislative enactment or executive regulation.
- Legislative bodies and governing boards will increase their micromanagement of student behavior, reflective of attempts during the 1960s to regulate campus protests and demonstrations.
- Administrators will become more circumspect about collecting information on student behavior (i.e., student drug and alcohol usage) because of the potential repercussions this information could have on the public image of the institution.

Accountability for Cost Efficiency

Medicare, Medicaid, prison construction, and K-12 education have pressed states to reorder their budgetary priorities. In the process, higher education has suffered. As other portions of state budgets increased, higher education's portion declined (Mahtesian, 1995). Colleges and universities responded to budget constraints with tuition and fee increases. Estimates by the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education (1998), an independent group established in 1997 by Congress, concluded that the annual cost at four-year public institutions rose during the past decade by 51% and at private institutions by 33%. Although statistics of this type can be manipulated and the costs are not uniform across all institutions, few would dispute that the cost of higher education during the past decade has increased at a rate significantly greater than inflation.

Not surprisingly, those outside of higher education are quick to propose efficiencies for the academy. People who have found models that seem to work well in business believe that greater efficiency and cost savings could be realized if higher education were to follow any number of business strategies. In more pragmatic terms, the accountability for cost savings and efficiencies have resulted in moves to outsource and downsize various student services. These efforts are usually based on the popular belief that government agencies, including state-supported universities, are fraught with mismanagement, waste, and an overabundance of unnecessary employees; thus, greater efficiency and cost savings can be achieved by letting private enterprise take over various functions (Healy, 1996). Proof of these beliefs among trustees and entrepreneurial legislators comes from the corporate reengineering that took place throughout the early 1990s and resulted in downsizing and privatizing at major multinational corporations such as Xerox, IBM, and AT&T.

Some of the effects of this demand for greater cost efficiencies in student services now and in the 21st century include the following:

- The number of for-profit companies specializing in student services such as financial aid, career development, counseling services, health services, and recreational sports will increase.
- More institutions will outsource some student services, and the costs of in-house student service operations will be compared against the costs of outsourcing these same services.
- An increasing number of people who enter student affairs will work for companies that provide outsourcing services for universities, and their allegiance will be corporate rather than institutional.
- More student service fees will be unbundled from institutional fees and converted to user fees in a system where students pay for the services they want.
- Chief student affairs officers will find more of their time consumed with contract negotiations, the preparation of bid specifications, and labor disputes with non-university personnel.
- Some student affairs organizations will be downsized and reengineered to be combined with academic services as a means of reducing the number of department heads and as a way to centralize more responsibility in academic affairs or business affairs.

Accountability for the Effectiveness of Student Affairs Programs

Politicians, trustees, and the media have proposed that increased institutional accountability will result from requiring institutions to report objective measures of performance. These measures were designed to force institutions to put tenure-track faculty back in the classroom. Few, if any, of the productivity indicators address contributions by student affairs educators. Those measures of students affairs that do exist focus primarily on measuring student satisfaction. Absent have been measures of leadership skills, interpersonal skills, psychosocial development, experiential learning, or other student learning outcomes associated with student affairs programs.

Excluding productivity measures for student affairs programs ignores student affairs' contribution to student learning and reinforces the belief that learning is exclusive to the classroom. If institutional productivity is measured only by classroom activities, the argument that institutional resources should be channeled away from student affairs programs and into classroom activities is strengthened.

A large volume of work demonstrating what students learn in college is available but little of this research shows how student affairs programs and personnel directly influence student outcomes (Astin, 1993; Love, 1995; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Most of student affairs' influence on educational outcomes is inferential and indirect. Unless student affairs educators can show how their programs, activities, and services relate directly to student outcomes such as technical competency, communication, critical thinking, ability to function in a global community, and adaptability, the profession's role in higher education will be diminished.

The implications of using performance-based information as objective means for assessing effectiveness in student affairs programs include the following:

- Student affairs organizations will be expected to report more data to demonstrate productivity (i.e., student contact hours).
- Because the contributions of student affairs programs to student learning are not widely accepted or understood, student affairs organizations will have their effectiveness measured principally by student satisfaction on a consumer-based management model.
- More student affairs organizations will add student life research units to assess student affairs contributions to student learning and to collect and report other institutional data.
- As more research data become available at institutions, there will be a need to reduce this information to simple ratings, comparisons, and rankings. Reports by popular magazines that rank colleges, such as *U.S. News and World Report*, will become increasingly important to institutions' success and financial stability. Formulas used by these groups to construct rankings will influence institutional policies, particularly at institutions heavily dependent on enrollment for funding.

Implications for Research

The demand for increased accountability for student learning is an invitation for student affairs to demonstrate its contributions. Although many performance-based assessments are devoid of measures of student affairs' efforts to advance student learning, the opportunity exists to expand these measures of assessment. A research agenda of student outcomes associated with students' out-of-class experiences is rich with possibilities.

Cost efficiency efforts focused on providing lower-cost educational delivery through distance education or through programs designed to shorten time to graduation offer a host of interesting research questions. For example, do students who receive most of their education via distance learning learn as much, graduate at the same rate, become loyal alumni, and acquire the same range of skills and knowledge as those students who have had the benefit of traditional on-campus instruction and involvement with the university community? Similar questions can be asked of students who have participated in programs designed to compress the educational experience from 4-5 years to 2-3 years.

All of the concerns that gave rise to the accountability movement in higher education can be researched: Was student behavior improved by releasing more information or imposing more rules and regulations on students? Did outsourcing of a student

service result in greater student satisfaction or more student learning? These and similar questions deserve inquiry.

Conclusion

An outgrowth of the accountability movement in higher education has been a compartmentalizing of the college experience into disconnected components without the recognition that student learning is an integrated experience. This segmentation is exacerbated by opposing forces pulling higher education in opposite directions. On the one hand, legislators chastise higher education for its failure to address major social problems such as campus violence, substance abuse, and academic integrity; on the other hand, they call for content-only forms of education through technology-based instruction, outcomes assessment focused on narrow cognitive skills, and programs to reduce the time in college. The college experiences which might have the best chance of building a socially responsible and educated citizenry can be lost to students who accumulate credits toward graduation without also accumulating experiences that bring meaning to their learning.

Historically, the two basic approaches to higher education can be classified as content-centered education and student-centered education. Those who hold the content-centered view of education see higher education as a means to social mobility and a better life through the mastery of a defined body of knowledge and skills. Characterized by specialization and professionalization required for performance in industry, content-centered education is focused on the need for an educated work force. In this content-centered view, technology allows higher education to be delivered in any fashion and at any location. Credits toward graduation can be gathered from various educational institutions. A licensing or certifying examination might be given to standardize the knowledge basis necessary to enter employment in a field, and students can graduate from a university without having set foot on the campus, met personally with a faculty member, or shared conversation with another student.

The contrast to content-centered education is student-centered education. Developing an educated citizen is its core purpose. Content mastery is important, but the curricular focus is on preparing a liberally educated person who can earn a living and who knows how to live. Good citizenship, ethics, values, and an appreciation for the aesthetic qualities of life are accepted as goals in addition to the mastery of information. LeBaron Russell Briggs (1904), the first Dean of Students, defined this student-centered purpose best when he wrote that the main object of college was "to establish character, and to make character more efficient through knowledge; to make moral character more efficient through mental discipline" (p. 7).

Student affairs work is compromised under a content-centered educational philosophy which advances the belief that personal responsibility, interpersonal skills, teamwork, trust, civility, the art of expression, taste, discrimination, and mental courage are qualities one can teach over the Internet, learn exclusively from a book, or access solely with a paper and pencil instrument. The accumulation of courses on an academic transcript is not an adequate substitute for qualities of an educated citizen.

Through student-centered education, student affairs professionals help to build educated and informed citizens. They structure the peer group environment, enrich the campus culture, elevate the conversation about issues of rights and responsibilities, hold students accountable for their behavior, nurture the emergence of leadership, mentor less confident students in meeting their highest challenges, and construct opportunities that allow students to experience elements of life that empower them with self-knowledge. Absent these experiences, students have something less than a college education.

Increased demand for accountability may strip student affairs of the tools it most needs. The challenges are many. They include demonstrating how student affairs contributes to valued educational goals; providing programs that result in student learning, high-quality services, and educated citizens; and working to refocus higher education on its fundamental student-centered learning mission.

References

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bernstein, N. (1996, May 5). With colleges holding court, discretion vies with fairness. *The New York Times*, p. 16.

Breneman, D. W. (1993). *Higher education: On a collision course with new realities*. Boston: American Student Assistance.

Briggs, L. R. (1904). *College life*. Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press.

Gamson, Z. F. (1987). An academic counter revolution. The roots of the current movement to reform undergraduate education. *Educational Policy, 1*, 429-444.

Harvey, J. (1996, January/February). Fragile support for higher education. *Association of Governing Boards*, *4*, 7-11.

Healy, P. (1996). The Republican contract with public colleges: Activist trustees raise questions on finances, curriculum, racial preferences. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 42*(20), p. A27.

Hoekema, D. A. (1994). *Campus rules and moral community: In place of in loco parentis*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield.

Honan, W. H. (1998, January 4). The ivory tower under siege. *The New York Times* (Education Life, Section 4A), pp. 33, 44, 46.

Levine, A. (1996, January/February). Education reform: Designing the end game. *Change*, p. 4.

Love, P. G. (1995). Exploring the impact of student affairs professionals on student outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*(2), 163-170.

Mahtesian, C. (1995, July). Higher ed: The no-longer-sacred cow. *Governing*, 20-26.

National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education (1998, January). *Straight talk about college costs and prices*. Washington, DC: Author.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sheehan, R. (1996, September 29). Campus courts on trial. *The Sunday News and Observer*, pp. 1A, 20A.

Sowell, T. (1995, November 20). Fork over and shut up. *Forbes*, 130.

Wadsworth, D. (1995). The new public landscape: Where education stands. *AAHE Bulletin, 47*(10), 14-17.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ON

Accountability for Student Affairs: Trends for the 21st Century

Gregory S. Blimling, Vice Chancellor
Student Development Office
Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina

1. What learning outcomes are associated with students' interactions with student affairs educators?
2. Do students who receive most of their education via distance learning learn as much, graduate at the same rate, and acquire the same range of skills and knowledge as those students who have had the benefit of traditional on-campus instruction and involvement with the university community?
3. Do students who have taken accelerated courses to reduce the amount of time in college benefit as much from the educational experience as students who take a longer time (4-5 years) to graduate?
4. Does outsourcing of a student service (e.g., counseling) result in greater satisfaction and more learning at less cost?
5. Does the release of the names of students who have committed acts of violence on campus improve campus safety or deter others from similar acts for fear of public attention?
6. Are students more or less likely to report occurrences of acquaintance rape knowing that the alleged perpetrator may be identified and that he or she may publicly identify the victim?
7. Is student satisfaction — a common measure of student affairs performance — associated with increased student learning, retention, or graduation?
8. What services and programs do students expect student affairs organizations to provide through electronic student services?

Changing Government Roles Relative to Higher Education

Annette Gibbs
L.K. Bunker Professor of Higher Education and
Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia

One of the primary forces in American society directly impacting the nature of higher education is the changing role of government at both the national and state levels. This shifting role does not imply a necessarily negative position, but it does pose serious challenges for colleges and universities. The basic parameters of this changing government role are characterized by: (1) new social priorities; (2) an increasing willingness to intrude upon traditional institutional prerogatives, (3) shifting government-sponsored student aid and research agendas, and (4) the public's declining confidence in higher education.

New Social Priorities

Higher education's thriving period of growth has subsided. Growth in the number of new institutions has peaked, and for all practical purposes, enrollment markets are nearing saturation. Mass higher education is no longer a dominant or unified goal of federal government, and most states, as well, currently are witnessing major and competing social needs among their citizenry. Concerns about health care and its escalating costs, including Medicare and Medicaid, crime, corrections, and the growing needs of elementary and secondary schools, constitute the priorities of most states. Deteriorating bridges, roads, sewer networks, and air traffic control systems now characterize much of America's "infrastructure" and serve to create additional complexities in determining which social needs receive priority and what levels of priority. These circumstances are forcing both the federal government and the states to redefine their social and economic agendas, and the result is that higher education, increasingly, is considered just another interest group seeking funds from the public purse. In fact, evidence indicates that state funding of public colleges and universities is now ranked below prisons, health care, and K-12 education (Davies, 1997). Governors say they want increased funding for higher education, but before supporting such allocations to institutions, they favor technology as the primary vehicle for enhancing student access, and 97 percent of the governors surveyed have proposed tying funding to performance measures (Canales, 1998, 32). Half of the states now link some of their funding to public colleges to the institutions' performance, and all "but a handful" appear likely to do so within the next five years, according to the recent Rockefeller Institute's Public Higher Education Report data (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1998).

Numerous colleges and universities have reorganized and reengineered themselves to do more with less, but in reality, institutions may have to do less with less. Tuition rising faster than inflation, the costs of remedial education (and supported by taxpayers the third time since most of these subjects, also, are taught in high schools and community colleges), and graduates' vocal claims of their lack of job opportunities, have magnified the urgency for streamlining academic offerings and adapting the realities of the environment surrounding higher education institutions (Levine, 1997).

American corporations are moving at a rapid pace to provide educational programs for meeting their corporate and labor force needs (Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence, 1998). Although most of these corporate educational organizations focus on specific job knowledge and skills, they, nonetheless, take away potential students from traditional colleges and universities. Cor-

porate chartered colleges are growing in numbers and many are seeking and earning regional accreditation just as any other higher education institution (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1992).

In addition to this rapidly emerging educational sector, American society is also witnessing the entry of for-profit colleges into the traditional higher education market. Many educators contend that these proprietary schools are attractive for recent high school graduates, particularly students of color, who want a practical education in a shorter time than that offered by traditional four-year institutions; moreover, older individuals consider these institutions to be an accessible means of attaining the requisite education for advancing their careers (Collison, 1998). Such schools typically have reputations for good job placement, they possess direct communication networks with businesses, and they publicize widely the fact that their faculty members are practitioners in the fields they teach.

Finally, the American citizenry may now consider still another higher education alternative, the virtual university. Political leaders, corporate executives, and some traditional college and university officials appear to share consensus that virtual learning and teaching activities through the Internet and the World Wide Web are of paramount importance in terms of future social agendas. Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1998, 13) report that the Western Governors Association, while originally proposing a virtual university in twenty-one Western states, scaled back to include 14 participating states. By late 1997, each of the states had contributed $100,000 to implement the project, and corporations were contributing toward the $25 million project operation. It is clear that neither state governors, legislatures, nor corporate America are waiting for traditional colleges and universities to restructure, refocus, and provide new and different educational programs. They are providing financial support for and are moving definitively to provide labor market oriented educational activities and programs.

Government Intrusiveness

Government has influenced American higher education throughout its history. Curriculum content, student access, diversity among types of institutions, and cutting-edge research are only some examples of the transformations that accompanied the Morrill Act, the Hatch Experimental Station Act, the G.I. Bill, and the Higher Education Amendments of 1965 and 1972, all initiated by federal legislation (Brubacher and Rudy, 1997). More recently, however, public wariness and growing skepticism about the effectiveness and efficiency of public higher education have led state and federal governments to reach inside institutions to change and shape how they operate (Terenzini, 1998).

The current political landscape surrounding higher education may best be depicted as governmental intrusion into the traditional functions and processes of colleges and universities. Such governmental actions have pervaded institutional instructional policy, and in numerous instances have determined or intruded upon mission and program offerings as well as administrative objectives (Lyall, 1996).

Federal mandates and reporting requirements related to campus crime, Americans with disabilities, freedom of information, affirmative action, student aid, clean air, occupational health and safety, family educational rights and privacy, and research involving human subjects, among others, provide significant governmental involvement in the daily activities and operations of academe. And, such governmental regulation does not appear to be abating. Current proposed federal legislation, for example, would require colleges to report hate crimes, or crimes that appear to be motivated by prejudice. The revisions to the Telecommunications Act may limit or proscribe colleges' access to certain telecommunications which would intrude upon the delivery of distance learning opportunities.

The Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 requires that colleges report names, addresses, and Social Security numbers of all their students, as well as whether they are enrolled at least half time. This is mandated whether or not students have filed for financial aid, but if they have, colleges will be required to also report their parents' Social Security numbers. Congress has agreed that the Internal Revenue Service needs these data in order to determine which students qualify for the next tax breaks, and the requirements become effective January 1, 1999.

State level mandates and legal requirements are no less intrusive. To date, public postsecondary institutions in twenty-three states are under a consolidated governing board system. This allows these states to give priority to statewide educational needs of the mission

or priorities of individual institutions. Another twenty-one states have organized their public colleges and universities under a coordinating board which also works to serve state needs by coordinating private higher education organizations as well (Lyall, 1996). Few would be opposed to the goals of either state-wide consolidated governing boards or coordinating boards, but in practice, their varying levels of intrusiveness provide paramount challenges, as well as opportunities, for higher education institutions. These boards, at a minimum, portray that more and more decisions about public colleges and universities are not made on the individual campuses.

The current anti-affirmative actions efforts by state legislatures are providing still another collision with college and university prerogatives for admitting minority students and awarding financial aid. Since late 1996, bills have been introduced in 13 state legislatures to abolish affirmative-action programs (National Center for Postsecondary Improvement [NCPI], 1998). Higher educational officials know too well the troubling effects of the reversal of affirmative-action policies. For example, the *Hopwood v. Texas* (1996) decision, alone, has virtually eliminated the enrollment of African-American students at the University of Texas Law School. And, one year after the implementation of California's Proposition 209, the number of African-American applicants admitted to the entire University of California higher education system declined by 18 percent (NCPI, 1998, 46).

Higher education advocates generally agree that many of the successes of colleges and universities are due, in part, to governmental legislation and financial support. However, as pressure mounts between and among competing social and political priorities in the state houses and at the federal level, higher education institutions are witnessing more governmental intervention. And, as long as colleges depend on public-sector support, "decisions by government policy makers will have a significant impact on their shape and structure" (Hartle and Galloway, 1997, 30).

Shifting Government-Sponsored Student Aid and Research Agendas

Federally supported research and student financial aid have increased substantially since Congress passed the Higher Education Act of 1965. However, the shift during recent years from federal grants to loans serves to jeopardize access to higher education for middle-income and low-income students. Community colleges and liberal arts institutions, already, are documenting such to be the unwanted reality. College student affairs professionals have long known that many ethnic groups are unwilling to borrow large sums of money, and the declining availability of government grants will prevent many — those who need it the most — from enrolling in higher education (Hartle and Galloway, 1997).

The seriousness of these circumstances is underscored by the College Board data which show that in 1994-95, $5.6 billion was awarded in Pell Grants, but over $24 billion was distributed through loans, yielding a loan-to-grant ratio of 4.4 to 1. In 1977-78, as an example, $1.7 billion was borrowed under the loan program while $1.5 billion was awarded in Pell Grants, yielding slightly over one dollar borrowed for every dollar of grants (College Board, 1995, 18).

On a more positive note, a recent development that most college and university proponents find encouraging is the 1997 higher education tax code changes which allow over $30 billion to benefit academe and its students over the next five years (Taxpayer Relief Act). These benefits focus on higher education tax deductions and credits, an expanded education IRA, and other tax law changes. Again, since these tax benefits accrue primarily to individuals rather than institutions, there is considerable concern that poorer students will not be aware of the possibilities, not have sufficient annual income to benefit from the new tax credits, and not be financially able to purchase educational IRAs.

In addition to the federal government's changing approach to providing student aid, research institutions, in particular, are finding themselves in more intense competition for scarce research dollars as Congress attempts to balance the federal budgets and meet other, competing social needs. This problem, obviously, will become most acute for the colleges and universities which receive significant portions of their funding from federally supported research. The University of Washington, as an illustration, receives nearly one-third of its funding from federal sources, most of which is for research. In fact, although the *percentage* of federal government sponsored research has diminished during recent years, when compared to the increased funding *percentage* from business and private giving, about 60% of all research done in the nation's colleges and univer-

sities is funded by the federal government (Hartle and Galloway, 1997). It becomes apparent that any future funding cuts would have significant impacts on these institutions since they constitute the segment of American higher education that, traditionally, has attracted the most academically prepared graduate students and the strongest research oriented faculty.

At the state level, governors have begun "to draw distinctions between research 'that is fundamentally important to society versus the stuff that is generated to promote tenure,'" and fewer than half the governors believe that state supported four-year colleges and research universities are responsive to state needs (Schmidt, 1998, A38). It is no wonder that states' elected leaders are attempting not only to change the ways colleges do business but also to mandate institutional performance measures. As many as eight states, thus far, have levied a tuition surcharge on their public colleges and/or students attending those colleges who take more academic courses than are necessary to complete their degree requirements (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1997). It seems clear that not only how institutions educate students is being called into question but also the *amount* of education the students receive.

It is, therefore, no secret to the higher education community that government-sponsored student aid and research agendas have shifted to requiring more from both institutions and students. Institutions must show greater efficiency, cost-effectiveness, documentation of quality, and how they measure the outcomes of their performance. Students, in turn, are being required to pay a larger share of their higher education costs at both public and private institutions, and when receiving financial aid, they will have more, and larger, loans while receiving fewer, and smaller, grants.

Declining Public Confidence in Higher Education

The political intricacies of both state and federal elected leadership in agreeing upon social priorities and then appropriating applicable funding is complicated further by the public's declining confidence in higher education. Historically, American higher education has promoted itself as one of the nation's greatest resources, but the general public is now voicing a diminishing belief in and trust in what a college degree actually means. Public opinion research shows that numerous individuals know and appreciate the potential value of higher education, but they also express concern about affordability, access, and whether faculty and administrators are truly committed to undergraduate education and student learning. Callan's (1996) national poll and interviews revealed that many Americans are more supportive of and more critical of higher education. They question the value of much academic research, and they are concerned whether a college degree can open the door to satisfactory employment and a better life.

> "Trying to place blame for this phenomenon is futile. The emergence of a world economy; the reduction of federal expenditures for defense; the slowing of economic growth; the phenomenal pace of technological change and its pervasive impact; and the restructuring, reinventing, and reengineering of major institutions in the corporate, governmental, and nonprofit sector—all have positive features, but all have played a part in placing the nation's colleges and universities in jeopardy." (40)

This eroding public confidence is not necessarily about the importance of higher education but rather about the operation of and functioning of colleges and universities. These public perceptions of higher education, as discussed above, also travel to governors' offices, state lawmakers, and the various branches of national government. With other pressing issues to address, governmental legislative and executive officials therefore appear willing to treat public higher education as an expenditure rather than an investment in the future. Such a philosophical and politically pragmatic approach by either state or national government means that colleges and universities could become drastically different organizations from the institutions of today. Some may have significantly fewer classrooms and more technology-driven activities; other institutions might serve primarily as broker organizations for connecting teachers and learners; and still others may provide more non-degree state-of-art educational programs while awarding fewer traditional degrees.

The higher education institution's future focus, then, will be to provide new ways of meeting individuals' learning needs amid the complexities of their social, economic, and political environments. It thus becomes

imperative for colleges and universities, in general, and student affairs, in particular, to articulate and communicate what they can contribute to student learning and, therefore, to American society.

Specific Implications for Student Affairs

Student affairs, as a profession, must adjust to new societal imperatives and changing government roles. It is of paramount importance that the profession refocus itself for defining and practicing new delivery modes. When compared to past practice, college university student affairs, in the future, will need to consider and accommodate the following realities.

- Student affairs professionals will need a deeper understanding of how their contributions "fit" with the mission and goals of the institutions they serve.
- The student affairs profession must be able to show how its contributions can enhance student learning relative to one's making choices, understanding the consequences of the choices, and moving toward living a productive life within the larger society.
- Student affairs practitioners should become more knowledgeable regarding how state and federal legislation impact their colleges and universities and thus the student affairs profession.
- To provide adequate financial support for student affairs, many practitioners, particularly senior level professionals, will find it necessary to enhance their traditional abilities and skills with an understanding and knowledge of philanthropy and fundraising.
- The student affairs profession should strengthen and enhance its future by educating new professionals for advising, counseling, testing, teaching, and providing applicable services through technology.
- Admitting more diverse and educationally disadvantaged traditional students as well as more nontraditional, older students and their corresponding more complex academic and vocational advising needs will necessitate that student affairs practitioners not only expand their knowledge for working with these learners but also to find better and more cost effective methods for doing so.
- Individuals within the profession not only should be proponents for student development and learning but also become college and university-wide leaders for accommodating these new learners and new learning needs of contemporary society.
- Future student affairs professionals will find opportunities for employment and professional practice in corporations and in proprietary institutions as more and more individuals become learners within these organizations.
- Student affairs practitioners in proprietary schools and corporate institutions will need expanded and in-depth organizational skills as well as the profession's traditional skills since their career promotions and advancements will depend upon their contributions to the organization.

References

Brubacker, J.S. and Rudy, W. (1997). *Higher education in transition*, 4th ed. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Callan, P.M. (1996, Summer). Toward a new consensus. *Liberal Education*, 82.

Canales, J. (1998, July/Aug.). Governors say they want to assert leadership to higher education. *Trusteeship*, 6.

Chronicle of Higher Education (1997, August 29). Issues affecting colleges: Roll call of the states, 44, 12.

Chronicle of Higher Education (1998, July 24). States increasingly link budgets to performance. 44, A26.

College Board (1995). Trends in student aid: 1985 to 1995. New York: College Board.

Collison, M. N-K (1998, July 9). Proprietary preference. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, *15*, 32-34.

Davies, G.D. (1997, Oct.). Higher-education systems as cartels: The end is near. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *44*, A68.

Hartle, T.W. and Gallaway, F.J. (1997). *Federal guidance for a changing national agenda.* In Peterson, M.W., Dill, D.D. and Mets, L.A., Planning and management for a changing environment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hopwood v. Texas, 95 F.3d 53 (5th Cir., 1996).

Levine, A. (1997, July-Aug.). Higher education becomes a mature industry. *About Campus*, 2.

Lyall, K.C. (1996, Winter-Spring). The role of government in systems. *Journal for Higher Education Management*, 11.

National Center for Postsecondary Improvement (1998, July-August). Are the doors closing? Assessing affirmative-action. *Change*, *30*, 43-46.

Rowley, D.J., Lujan, H.D., and Dolence, M.G. (1998). *Strategic choices for the academy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schmidt, P. (1998, July 19). Governors want fundamental changes in colleges. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 44.

Terenzini, P.T. (1998, June 1). *Personal correspondence to author.*

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE). (1992). Meeting economic and social challenges: A strategic agenda for higher education. Boulder, Colo: Authors.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS ON

The Changing Government Roles in the 21st Century

Annette Gibbs
L.K. Bunker Professor of Higher Education and
Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia

Developing societal trends and priority shifts among the states, as well as the federal government, relative to their prerogatives clearly portray definitive and significant changes for the future. Educators must conceptualize, plan, and implement new organizational approaches for the delivery of educational programs and activities. The following questions focus upon and serve to guide educators as they move to the next century.

What are the most effective ways for states to support higher education?

1. How may educators become more influential in working with state policy makers to benefit colleges and students?
2. What assumptions do members of the higher education community hold relative to the merits of part-time and/or community college students receiving state-allocated financial aid? Are these assumptions appropriate for affecting change at the state government level?
3. If state funding becomes increasingly linked to perceived institutional performance, what role should educators take to address this trend? What specific responsibilities should student affairs undertake?
4. Should colleges and universities pursue more definitively and more aggressively potential educational options with corporations and proprietary schools? How might this approach benefit colleges and students?
5. What are the assumptions about increasing the amount of government funds available for college student loans while decreasing the availability of grant monies? Do these assumptions translate to economic gains/losses for states in terms of graduates going into the work force, not attending college, etc.?

What societal conditions are impacting higher education practice?

1. When does government support become government intrusion?
2. Do state policy makers define "accountability" in the same way as do educators? Does the academic community consider itself accountable? How?
3. Are there reasons why Congress and state governments legislate legal requirements upon colleges and universities relative to their relationships with their students?
4. How may educators transform the imperatives of these societal conditions into positive working relationships with government policy makers for the betterment of colleges and universities and their students?
5. How can states ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of public higher education while minimizing transient political agendas that may be detrimental to state-wide educational needs?

What educational practices are necessary to accommodate shifting social conditions and priorities?

1. How can college and university missions, or purposes, become more precisely defined?
2. To what extent do educators understand or have access to knowledge about the relationship between purpose (state-wide, individual institution, etc.) and administrative practice?
3. How should new degree programs offered over the internet be evaluated or held accountable?
4. What responsibilities do educators hold for determining which research "is important to society vs. that important for peers' tenure"?
5. What is the process for the leadership of higher education institutions to restore public confidence in the way colleges and universities function and serve their publics?

AMERICAN COLLEGE PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION
SENIOR SCHOLARS

ACPA SENIOR SCHOLARS
HIGHER EDUCATION TRENDS ANALYSIS MEETING
June 27, 1997 – Washington, D.C.

Marcia Baxter Magolda — Miami University, Oxford, OH

Gregory Blimling — Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

Harold Cheatham — Clemson University, Clemson, SC

Nancy Evans — Iowa State University, Ames, IA

Annette Gibbs — University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA

Don Hossler — Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

Cynthia Johnson — California State University, Long Beach, CA

Karen Kitchener — University of Denver, Denver, CO

Patricia King — Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH

Susan Komives — University of Maryland, College Park, MD

Arthur Sandeen — University of Florida, Gainesville, FL

Charles Schroeder — University of Missouri, Columbia, MO

William Sedlacek — University of Maryland, College Park, MD

Frances Stage — Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

Patrick Terenzini — Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

Lee Upcraft — Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

*denotes attendance at meeting

Higher Education Association Representatives:

AAC&U — Association of American Colleges & Universities: ***Carol Schneider,*** Executive Vice President

AACC — American Association of Community Colleges: ***Margaret Rivera,*** Director of Membership

AAHE — American Association for Higher Education: ***Peg Miller,*** President & ***Ted Marchese,*** Vice President

ACPA — American College Personnel Association: ***Jean Paratore,*** President–Elect & ***Carmen Neuberger,*** Executive Director

ACE — American Council on Education: ***Reginald Wilson,*** Senior Scholar

ASHE — Association for the Study of Higher Education: ***George Kuh,*** Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

AGB — Association of Governing Boards of Universities & Colleges: ***Sylvia Galloway,*** Director, Private Sector Programs

Campus Compact: ***Lisa McGettigan Chambers,*** Director of Michigan Campus Compact

CASE — Council for Advancement & Support of Education: ***Paul Chewning,*** Vice President, Prof. Development

CGS — Council of Graduate Schools: ***Anne Pruitt Logan,*** Dean in Residence

CNS — Corporation for National Service: ***Alexander Astin,*** University of California, Los Angeles, CA (Invited)

Fetzer Institute: ***Tony Chambers,*** Program Officer

NAFEO — National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education: ***Henry Ponder,*** President (Invited)

NASPA — National Association of Student Personnel Administrators: ***Jack Warner,*** President

NASULGC — National Association of State Universities & Land Grant Colleges: ***Dolores Spikes,*** President, University of Maryland Eastern Shore (Invited)

NAWE: Advancing Women in Higher Education: ***Gail Hanson,*** Immediate Past President

SCUP — Society for College and University Planning: ***David Hollowell,*** Executive Vice President, University of Delaware

University of Maryland, College Park Interns: Lisa Kiely, Sharon La Voy, John Hernandez

AMERICAN COLLEGE PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION
One Dupont Circle, NW • Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036-1110
(202) 835-2272 • Fax: (202) 296-3286
http: www.acpa.nche.edu
Email: info@acpa.nche.edu

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage Paid
Washington, DC
Permit No. 509

BEST COPY AVAILABLE